keep front cover on

TRANSACTIONS

of the

Moravian Historical Society

Transactions

VOLUME XVII

-18

Part I

Whitefield House
Nazareth, Pa.
1959

-62

PRINTED FOR THE SOCIETY BY
LAROS PRINTING CO.
EASTON, PA.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

86011

v.17-18
1957-62

THE MORAVIAN DIASPORA

A study of the societies of the Moravian Church
within the Protestant state churches of Europe

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in the
FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

by

JOHN RUDOLF WEINLICK

1951

Published by the

MORAVIAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Nazareth, Pennsylvania

1959

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter *Page*

INTRODUCTION 1

I. ZINZENDORF AND THE EMERGING MORAVIAN CHURCH 7

Herrnhut during the first five years. Events of the year 1727. The "Notariats Instrument," 1729. Events of the year 1732: judicial investigation, banishment of the Schwenkfelders, Zinzendorf ordered to sell his property, further immigration banned, sending out of first missionaries. Zinzendorf ordained, 1734. Consecration of the first bishop, 1735. The Count's banishment, 1736. His consecration as a bishop, 1737. Formulation of the tropus plan. Legal recognition of the Moravians in Prussia, 1742; in England and Saxony, 1749. The two-fold Moravian Church.

II. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DIASPORA 20

Zinzendorf's estimate of the Diaspora. The name Diaspora. The first itinerations. Travels supplemented by correspondence. Early statistics. Internal development. Selection of personnel. Attitude of the Diaspora membership to the state churches.

III. FROM ZINZENDORF TO THE CLOSE OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY 36

The ideals of the Count continue. Official statements of Diaspora principles. Development of rules and regulations. Wide influence of the Brethren during the late eighteenth century.

IV. THE NINETEENTH CENTURY 45

Opening years a period of standstill. Revival beginning in 1820. Caution required in relations with state church. The nature of typical Diaspora meetings. The Diaspora worker. Numerical peak at the mid-century. The coming of free churches. Growing spirit of secularism. Disturbing influence of sects. Effect of trend toward denominationalism upon the Brethren. The Diaspora and Inner Missions. The Diaspora and foreign missions. Numerical strength at the close of the century.

V. THE TWENTIETH CENTURY 63

Recovery of morale at the turn of the century. The Diaspora circuits. Diaspora strength moves eastward. Effects of World War I. Administrative changes of 1920. Four categories of Diaspora work. Non-resident members and friends. Youth Society. Trombone Choir League. Moravian *Daily Texts*. Health resort at Bad Boll. Order of Moravian Deaconesses. Alumni of Moravian schools.

Chapter *Page*

VI. THE DIASPORA IN THE RUSSIAN BALTIC PROVINCES. 82
Location of Diaspora. Introduction of Pietism. Visit of Zinzendorf to Livonia and Estonia, 1736. The Brethren begin work at Wolmar, 1737. Revival of 1741 and trouble following. The Count's wife visits Russia. Banishment of Brethren by edict, 1743. Zinzendorf's visit and its failure. Quiet progress, 1743-1762. Accession of Catherine II, 1762, brings tolerance. Progress during second half of the century. Legal recognition by edict of Alexander I, 1817. Survey of circuits and membership. Growing opposition of state church. Restrictive measures, 1840. Growing tension between nationals of the Diaspora and authorities. Work steadily deteriorating. Russian nationalism gradually forces withdrawal of German Brethren. Greater freedom following Revolution of 1905. Better relations between Lutherans and Moravians. World War I and its aftermath. Limited resumption of Diaspora work before World War II.

VII. THE DIASPORA IN SWEDEN..... 112
Nature of the Swedish Diaspora. Pre-Moravian Pietism in Sweden. Early Moravian contacts, 1727-1739. Establishment of the Diaspora through the work of three pioneers, Thore Odhelius, Elias Ostergren, and Arvid Gradin, 1739-1742. Impact of the Diaspora up to 1745. Excesses of the Sifting Period, 1745-1750. Set-back resulting from the Sifting Period. Recovery and growth in the latter third of the century. Efforts to found a settlement congregation, 1773-1788. Extent of Diaspora influence at the close of the eighteenth century. Rise of new religious influences in the nineteenth century relegate Moravians to a position of lesser importance. Diaspora influence more confined to the circle of society membership. State of the work during the past century up to the present. Summary of Moravian influence in Sweden.

VIII. THE MINISTERS' CONFERENCE AT HERRNHUT... 144
Origin and purpose. The nucleus of an extensive circle. Its program. Problems discussed. Correspondence: Basel ministers, London Missionary Society, British and Foreign Bible Society, various countries, Fellowship with Roman Catholics. Contact with prominent religious figures. End of the conference. Its significance.

IX. THE EFFECT OF THE DIASPORA UPON THE AMERICAN MORAVIAN CHURCH..... 155
Close attachment to Europe. The Pennsylvania Synods. Bethlehem organized on the settlement pattern. Extensive itinerant religious work. Communicant and society members. Many adherents, but few members in Colonial Moravian Churches. A few new churches in the early nineteenth century. Mid-century home mission awakening. Diaspora immigrants a point of contact. Diaspora methods followed by home missionaries. Spirit of denominational advance gradually triumphs. Retarded beginnings a reason for the small size of the American Moravian Church.

Chapter *Page*

X. SOCIETY VERSUS ECCLESIA IN BRITAIN 173

Moravians in Britain mid-way between German and American situations. Beginnings in England. The society pattern. Wesley and the Moravians. Zinzendorf objects to Moravians being licensed. The Fetter Lane Society. Recognition by Parliament, 1749. Moravian beginnings compared to present status. Diaspora spirit continues to prevail in late eighteenth century. Denominational awakening too late to promote growth. Moravianism in Britain today.

XI. THE MORAVIANS IN POST-WAR GERMANY..... 189

The Moravian Church a refugee church. Diaspora experience used to meet the present situation. Ministry to a scattered membership. Mission activity in Diaspora circles. Two lines of development in prospect, revived Diaspora activity and new congregations.

XII. INTERPRETATION AND SUMMARY..... 195

Areas in which the Moravian contribution is evident: (1) influence on the state church, (2) missions, (3) inner missions, (4) Protestant unity, (5) the Romantic movement. The two-fold status of the Moravians as a church and as a society. The Diaspora and settlement congregations serve each other. The Diaspora and the free church movement. The Diaspora a source of supply for Moravian personnel. The Brethren a link between eighteenth and nineteenth century Pietism. Types of piety stimulated by the Diaspora. Center of gravity shifts to the denominational outlook.

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 215

PREFACE

The student of church history sees the Moravian Church as a zealous missionary church, and so it is. Or he thinks of Moravianism in terms of pietistic communities like Herrnhut, Saxony, and eighteenth century Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. This picture, too, is descriptive of an important phase of Moravianism. There is a third aspect which in Germany at least, and in other countries of Europe, also is characteristic of the Brethren. This is the Moravian Diaspora.

The King James Version of the Bible translates the Greek word "diaspora" as "scattered." I Peter refers to "the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia." It is in this sense of "scattered" that the word Diaspora is used in connection with the Moravian Church.

For well over two centuries in Europe there have been two kinds of Moravians, members of the fully organized congregations, and members of affiliated societies who at the same time are members of their respective state churches. Indicative of the scope of this work is the fact that while the membership of the Moravian Church on the continent of Europe has only of recent years exceeded 10,000, that of the Diaspora is estimated to have been over 75,000 at its peak.

The writer has long felt the need for more information on the subject. Hitherto it has been possible to get a picture of the Diaspora only after much searching for sketchy references in Moravian history books, in church periodicals, in synod reports. Of all the material on Moravian history there has been only one extensive work on the Diaspora, that of the German Lutheran pastor O. Steinecke, entitled *Die Diaspora der Bruedergemeine*, issued in two small volumes in 1905 and 1911 respectively. It confines its survey to Germany, and this, together with the fact that it was published forty years ago, limits its usefulness to the American reader, even if it were translated. Nevertheless, the writer has found Steinecke's work to be the most useful of the references cited. His extensive footnotes have greatly helped in pursuing primary sources.

Since the Diaspora is such an integral part of the overall program of the Brethren, it is impossible to isolate the material completely from general Moravian Church history. Some of the sections, therefore, may seem like repetition of what has already been done by others, as for instance the chapter on "Zinzendorf and the Emerging Moravian Church." Yet the delineation of this process is necessary in order to see the Diaspora in its context. The writer has incorporated facts already generally known to students of church history only where he feels these facts fit into the framework of this study.

As can be seen from the bibliography, much of the source material is in German. Unless otherwise indicated the translations are those of the writer.

This study is presented in the hope that it will help the reader to a better appreciation of the character of the Moravian Church. Perhaps also some may see in it ideas apropos of the present day wide spread ecumenical movement in Protestant Christianity.

Eight years have elapsed between the completion of this study and its printing. Therefore some of the information of the past decade is out of date. Since this account is primarily historical, no attempt has been made to revise any of the data. The picture of the Diaspora which is presented is that which existed up to the year 1951.

Moravian Theological Seminary
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania
June 16, 1959.

1

THE MORAVIAN DIASPORA

INTRODUCTION

The Renewed Moravian Church which came into being in 1722 is the product of three converging entities: Pietism, the personality of Count Nicolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf and the surviving remnant of the Church of the Bohemian Brethren. In following the development of the Diaspora we must keep these three factors in mind.

I. *Pietism*

German Pietism as fathered by Spener represents a pattern of religious life which is fairly common. It had its corresponding movements in other countries within the same general period of time. In general it was a protest against externalism and professionalism in religion, with emphasis upon feeling in Christian experience, a more or less ascetic tendency toward the world, and a prominent place for the laity in church life. These manifestations were to a certain degree a return to the early character of the Lutheran revolt.

We find in the ideas of Spener much of what Zinzendorf later proclaimed. Christianity, according to Spener, is more a life than it is intellectual knowledge. He attacked the controversial preaching of the clergy, calling for a new type of preaching designed to build up the Christian life of his hearers. He contended that if the "heart" is right, difference of intellectual interpretation are relatively unimportant. In Spener we see, too, ascetic tendencies after the pattern of the English Puritans, rejection of the theatre, dances and cards, and the inculcation of moderation in dress, food and drink. Zinzendorf, though not extreme on this point, early in his career found the usual social activities of the nobility little to his taste, and his Moravian settlements were strict in their regulations of amusements and dress.

Though Pietism was already past its peak when the Renewed Moravian Church came into being, it had prepared the soil for

the kind of work the Moravians were to do within the Lutheran, and to a lesser extent within the Reformed state churches. Significant is it that Halle during the first thirty years of its existence trained over six thousand church leaders, not to speak of the many more who had been trained in its lower schools and orphanages.[1] Dispersed throughout the land, these were to be points of contact for later Moravian Diaspora groups—as well as points of bitter opposition.

Mention has been made of corresponding evangelical stirrings in other lands. German Pietism tended to be conservative, and though there was in it also the impulse toward sectarianism, it remained within the confines of the established churches more than similar religious expression elsewhere.

II. *Nicolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf*

Nicolaus Ludwig, Count and Lord of Zinzendorf and Pottendorf, was born in Dresden on May 26, 1700. His father, George Ludwig von Zinzendorf and Pottendorf, was one of the premier ministers of the Saxon court. His mother was Charlotte Justina, Baroness of Gersdorf, his father's second wife. Both parents were learned, pious Christians, actively interested in the efforts of the Pietists to instill new life into the Lutheran Church. The close attachment of the family to this movement is shown in Spener, father of Pietism, being a sponsor at their son's baptism. Their home in Dresden was a meeting place for one of the "ecclesiolae" of the Pietists. Thus Zinzendorf early was exposed to the influence of "ecclesiola in ecclesia."

Six weeks after the birth of his son the elder count died of tuberculosis. His widow went to live with her parents until her re-marriage four years later to the Prussian Marshall Von Nazmer. From that time on young Nicolaus Ludwig saw little of her. Left under the care of his maternal grandmother, Lady Henrietta Catherine von Gersdorf, until the age of ten, he owed much of his boyhood spiritual development to her. She too was a Pietist. In her home religious meetings were commonplace. Men like Spener, Francke, Canstein, Anton were her frequent

1. *Cyclopedia of Ecclesiastical and Theological Literature*, III, p. 652, Harpers, New York, 1894.

guests. Pious, talented and cultured, a poetess, artist and musician of no mean ability, she occupied a position of influence in court circles.

Zinzendorf afterwards frequently said that it was this early environment which was responsible for "the loss of relish for anything but the doctrine of Jesus Christ, his merits, and his sufferings."[2]

Count Otto Christian, his uncle and guardian, finally yielded to the persuasion of Lady Gersdorf and sent the ten-year-old boy to Francke's school, the Paedogogium at Halle. There under strict Christian influence and rigorous discipline he remained for six years, continuing his religious development in the direction it had assumed from his earliest childhood. In fact, his predilection for things spiritual was one of the reasons for his not pursuing academic work too vigorously. Had he exerted all his energies along the latter line he probably would have attained distinction. His interests were otherwise. He continued his familiar intercourse with the Saviour. He sought out the fellowship of those of like-minded piety. Seven little associations for prayer and edification were founded by him.

Similar to the later "Holy Club" at Oxford, of which the Wesleys were members, was an association he formed with four intimates, Von Sohlenthal, Wallbaum, Von Tanz and De Watteville. One of the things they pledged themselves to was that in later life they would labor for the conversion of the heathen, and particularly for those whom others neglected. At this time graduates of Halle were already active in such work. Known first as "Knights of Virtue," then "Confessors of Christ," the little fellowship finally received the permanent name of "Order of the Grain of Mustard Seed."

The Count would have preferred continuing his studies at Halle, but his guardian had other plans. After spending the vacation season of 1716 with his grandmother and other relatives, he entered the University of Wittenberg in September for legal studies in preparation for a position in government service.

---

2. A. G. Spangenberg, *The Life of Nicholas Lewis Count Zinzendorf*, trans. Samuel Jackson, p. 2.

The fact that Wittenberg was in strong theological opposition to Francke at Halle was one of the reasons for Zinzendorf's being sent there. Moreover his uncle mapped out a carefully planned program of studies for him. So many hours were to be devoted to the study of law and so many to the mastery of the social skills of the nobility, fencing, riding, dancing. He acted in strict obedience. However, his leisure time was given to his true interests, theology, philosophy and natural science.

His devotion to religion deepened rather than diminished. Aware that an effort was being made to divert him from his endeavors after godliness, he tended to be legalistic in his attempts to keep his religious experience intact. Occasionally he would spend a whole night in prayer and meditation upon the word of God. As in Halle, there were in Wittenberg decisive reactions to him, his religious bent attracting some, repelling others. Here too the contacts were to be both to his advantage and disadvantage in the years ahead.

Zinzendorf's stay at Wittenberg lasted three years, after which time he made ready to set out on his travels to the various centers of learning and culture. This was a method of completing a formal university career common to those of his social status. If his guardian hoped that this "Wanderjahr" would deflect him from his religious interests, he was destined to be as disappointed as he was with the years in Wittenberg. At the university he had come to appreciate the religious position of the Wittenberg divines without losing his affection for his friends at Halle. His ambition to become a pastor had not been diminished. His travels were to confirm him more definitely in the conviction that the things of the world noblemen are supposed to be interested in were not for him.

Accompanied by his tutor, Riedner, and for a time his elder half-brother, Frederick Christian, he visited cities in Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium. At Utrecht he spent some time in the study of jurisprudence and English. The fall of 1719 and the spring of 1720 found him in Paris where he enjoyed close fellowship with distinguished Catholic clergy, particularly the Jansenist Cardinal Noailles. In France, as well as in Switzerland, and in

the Reformed cities of Germany he became better acquainted with and more appreciative of the churches of this tradition. We find in his reactions during this period the ecumenical tendencies so conspicuous in his later career.

Zinzendorf came of age in May of 1721 still resolved to become a preacher of the Gospel. In the home of his grandmother at Great Hennersdorf in Upper Lusatia during much of that year he meditated deeply upon his future. Being of age he was free to arrange his own material affairs. Loving the solitude of the country life in the neighborhood of his grandmother's domain, he conceived the idea of purchasing an estate and establishing a home which would at the same time be a religious community presided over by himself. This really was his second choice. His preference would have been for his family to agree to his becoming a full-fledged pastor.

But clerical orders were something uncommon for persons of rank in the Lutheran Church. The young Count, with all his deep religious convictions, was also conscious of his background, and ultimately bowed in obedience to what was proper. Reluctantly he accepted a position as judicial councillor in Dresden, formally taking his post some time in December of 1721. Obviously his heart was not in his work and from 1722 to 1727 he did little more than conciliate a couple of poor peasants with their squire. He spent much time in Dresden in religious discussion with folks of all walks of life, holding meetings in his home, composing hymns and poems. It was in these years that his idea of a fellowship of the children of Good took shape. Particularly was he concerned about Christians who were oppressed and persecuted.

During the early months of 1722 he purchased the estate of Berthelsdorf from his grandmother. The village of Berthelsdorf, included in the domain, had existed as a parish since 1346. At the time of the purchase the incumbent pastor died and Zinzendorf promptly installed his young friend Rothe of Dresden as the successor in the post. At the same time the Count began the erection of a home for himself, and was formally recognized as the

lord of the manor upon his arrival at Berthelsdorf on May 19. The acquisition of this property proved to be a decisive step in the direction of his future program of action.

In September of the same year he married Countess Erdmuth Dorothea Von Reuss, a sister of his good friend Count Henry 24th Reuss. It was a fortunate marriage, for the young countess proved to be ideally suited to cope with the Zinzendorf temperament and genius, and from the start wholeheartedly identified herself with his life plans.

III. *The Coming of the Moravians*

The year 1722 was decisive in another way also, for it was the year in which the Moravian exiles came to Upper Lusatia. Early in the spring Zinzendorf had met Christian David, the leader behind the effort to find an asylum for a few families from Moravia, secretly maintaining the ways of the Bohemian Brethren. The Count promised David temporary quarters at his newly acquired Berthelsdorf.

Several families of refugees arrived in June when Zinsendorf was absent in Dresden. After first visiting his grandmother, whose reception of them was not too cordial, they were placed under the care of Heitz, the Count's steward. It was his idea that the newcomers be placed, not in the village, but on an unsettled part of the estate. The spot selected was a prominent hill, called the Hutberg, a short walk to the southwest of Berthelsdorf. Almost immediately Christian David felled the first tree for the building of the community which was to become Herrnhut, the mother community of the Renewed Moravian Church.

The pattern was beginning to assume more definite shape. The naive religious vitality of Pietism as personified in the young Saxon Count was soon to be furnished with materials on which to express itself. What happened was quite different from what he had in mind. An inter-church fellowship, such as Zinzendorf wanted, came into being, but alongside of it there developed also an independent church. The emergence of these two together take us into the first phase of the rise of the Diaspora.

CHAPTER I

Zinzendorf and the Emerging Moravian Church

For the first few years of the migration of the exiles from Moravia to Herrnhut Zinzendorf did not regard the coming of the Moravians as of special significance. Knowing very little of the Bohemian Brethren, he had no thought of reviving their Brotherhood, and still less did he have in mind the founding of anything new.

> The arrival of the first Moravian emigrants, and their subsequent settlement on his estate of Berthelsdorf, to which Herrnhut belongs, took place during his absence, and almost without his knowledge; and according to his own declaration, his only object was to provide an asylum for these oppressed people, hoping that, by their pious example, they might be useful to his other tenants. Several years elapsed before he fully consented to these measures, by which the Ancient Church of the Brethren was revived and re-organized at Herrnhut; which made him repeatedly assert, that the work was not his; but that it was indeed the work of God.[1]

Maturing in his mind was the plan of a spiritual union of all Christian believers, and through this the promotion of vital godliness, according to the Pietist pattern of the "ecclesiolae."

To further this end Zinzendorf in August of 1723 entered into a covenant with three of his friends; Frederick de Watteville, his school associate at Halle; Pastor Rothe, his Berthelsdorf parish minister; and Pastor Schaeffer, the pietistically inclined minister of the nearby Goerlitz parish. Known as the "Order of the Four Brethren," this was in effect a renewal of the Order of the "Grain of Mustard Seed." The four pledged themselves to the cultivation of holiness in themselves and throughout the land, to carry on personal correspondence toward this aim, to enlist pulpits in promoting religious revival, to publish suitable literature, to work for the reformation of pastoral methods and of the inner life of the churches, to promote the work of itinerant personal evangelists, to provide for the establishment of Christian

1. John Holmes, *History of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren*, I, pp. 177-178.

schools.[2] Dresden, Goerlitz and especially Berthelsdorf immediately became the first centers of their projects.

The Four Brethren were sufficiently successful to arouse both enthusiasm and opposition within the years immediately following. They attracted a rapidly increasing number of associates. Members of the movement were active in correspondence, in travel, in the formation of devotional groups, in publication of religious literature, in the establishment of schools. The fact that Zinzendorf and de Watteville were of the nobility gave them connections extending their influence over much of the continent. It also helped to focus the attention of the opposition.

The years 1722-1727 were epoch making. Absorption in religious activities increasingly made the Count's post in Dresden distasteful to him. Herrnhut attracted a steady stream of exiles, creating both religious and political complications. Austrian authorities objected[3] to the emigration of its citizens and blamed Zinzendorf for their departure. Having left their own country for the sake of religious freedom, the Moravians were none too happy at being forced to worship as Lutherans as was the case at Berthelsdorf. Others besides the Moravian refugees had come to the community, among them some of strong Calvinistic leanings. Representing the completely separatist point of view was a contingent of Schwenkfelders.

For a while the very existence of the new settlement was threatened. To add to Zinzendorf's difficulties was the displeasure of his friends at Halle over what was taking place at Herrnhut-Berthelsdorf. Their opposition arose partly from disapproval of the sectarian tendencies which they saw exhibiting themselves, and partly because they had not been consulted in the establishment of activities so like those at Halle. Consequently we have in these crucial years the deepening of the breach between Moravian and Hallensian Pietism. Early in 1727 the Count found it necessary to take a leave of absence from Dresden and devote himself more fully to the situation. Four years later

2. Spangenberg, pp. 45-46.

3. To say that the Austrian authorities objected is stating the case mildly. Many would-be emigrants were imprisoned and harshly treated. Holmes, I, p. 184-185.

he completely relinquished his position with the government. Concerning his vacating his position in Dresden Spangenberg gives us an insight into the Count's frame of mind:

> The more the Count was confirmed in the conviction, that he was called of God to something different to worldly affairs, the more he wished to divest himself of a situation which hindered him from obeying his inward vocation. The decided will of his parents which had alone induced him to accept office in the state, had hitherto prevented him from seeking dismission from it. This hindrance was now removed by the decease of his grandmother; and after repeated letters on the subject to his mother, he at length, to his great joy, and almost contrary to his expectation, obtained her consent to the step he had so long wished to take.
>
> In 1727, therefore, he seriously endeavored to obtain his dismission; but some friends, whom he had consulted on the subject, thought he would do best, if he first requested permission to be absent longer than usual. To this he agreed, and it was granted him without difficulty.[4]

Besides the problem of the internal dissension, especially between the Lutheran and the Reformed point of view, there was the matter of the relationship of Herrnhut to the Berthelsdorf parish. After all, Herrnhut was not yet a parish, but was served by Pastor Rothe. Herrnhuters and Berthelsdorf members regarded each other uneasily. Zinzendorf, in consultation with Rothe and his legal advisor, Marche, drew up *Forty-two Statutess* regulating the life of Herrnhut as a voluntary religious society. Included in the statutes were certain provisions setting forth the relationship of the residents to Zinzendorf as their feudal Lord. The statutes were publicly accepted by the community on May 12, and at the same time twelve elders were chosen as supervisors.

In the course of the next few months the Count became acquainted with the system of church discipline of the Bohemian Brethren as set forth in their published *Ratio Disciplinae.* In this case it was the edition prepared by Comenius and published by Buddeus of Tuebingen[6] which he got hold of. Surprised at the

4. *Life of Count Zinzendorf*, p. 74.

5. These statutes are printed in a variety of Moravian publications, among them *The Memorial Days of the Renewed Moravian Church*, Appendix A, p. 110 ff.

6. *The Ratio Disciplinae*, or constitution of the Church of the Bohemian Brethren was first issued at Lissa, Poland, in 1633. The edition of Comenius was published in Amsterdam in 1660. Buddeus had this republished in 1702.

similarity between this and the statutes of May 12, Zinzendorf assumed a somewhat different attitude toward the Moravians. He began to regard the resuscitation of the Ancient Unity as possibly providential and Herrnhut as the means to that end, though this did not deflect him from his ideal of the spiritual non-denominational union of all true Christians.

By mid-summer harmony had been restored to the settlement. A memorable Communion service on August 13 is regarded as the real birthday of the Renewed Moravian Church. Herrnhut had been established on a firm footing. It was a voluntary religious community within the fold of the Saxon state church. At the same time the Moravian Brethren were happy in having retained their identity. Being officially classed as Lutherans did not distress them as long as they could have their own services and discipline in addition to the regular church services.

Temporarily this was a solution of the problem for Herrnhut, but for the future church of the Brethren it was only the beginning of a process of adjustment barely completed during the remaining lifetime of Zinnzendorf. Through the years the relationship between these two lines of development was to be a troublesome question. The original status of the Herrnhut community was that of an "ecclesiola in ecclesia." Further developments brought the impulse to become an independent denomination. Eventually there emerged the Renewed Moravian Church, both an ecclesia and an ecclesiola. Moravianism on the Continent was to be both a denomination and an inter-church society. In England and America Moravianism was to become purely a denomination, but with a strong Diaspora stamp, the latter being dominant enough to prevent both the English and American churches from achieving normal growth.

Though an original genius in more ways than one, the Count tried his best to be a conformist with reference to the laws of the land, including those pertaining to religion. Each step he took was done with a view to its legality. The Herrnhut statutes were adopted only after consultation with several divines as to whether it would be permissible to combine a special order of church discipline with the Lutheran doctrine and cultus.[7] Since even after 1727 many observers regarded Herrnhut as a community of dis-

senters the statutes were supplemented by a document of more legal dress in 1729, entitled "Injunctions and Prohibitions of the Magistrate," more commonly referred to by Moravians writers as the "Notariats-Instrument."[8] Zinzendorf in preparing such a document was exercising his right as lord of the manor. His procedure was to assemble the German and Bohemian ministers of Gross Hennersdorf, the parish minister and the court of justice at Berthelsdorf, and the men of the community. He had the Brethren affirm a set of declarations, later had them drawn up as a notary's instrument or deed, and on August 12, 1729, signed by eighty-three men of forty-seven different families. The document was ratified by the Count as lord of the territory on the following September 27 and by the Reverend Mr. Rothe as parish minister.

In this deed, containing thirteen sections, there is a narrative of the beginning of Herrnhut which emphasizes that the Brethren are neither separatists nor a new sect, but are the descendants of an historic church recognized by the reformers such as Luther and Calvin,[9] but wish not to be designated by any name other than Brethren. They declare their allegiance to the Augsburg Confession, and hope for the protection of the civil authorities as they try peacefully to abide by their own private regulations.

The notary's instrument did not put an end to suspicion and a little more than a year later the Count went so far as to propose the dropping of the discipline and the complete absorption into the Lutheran Church. The proposal stirred up great opposition and was placed before a congregation council where the decision was put to the lot. The lot decided in favor of retaining the traditional discipline of the Bohemian Brethren.

---

7. D. Cranz, *Ancient and Modern History of the Brethren*, trans. Benjamin La Trobe, p. 125.

8. *The Buedingische Samlungen*, I, beginning on page 3 contain an extract of the Notariats-Instrument. Cranz, p. 133, also has a documented account of the matter.

9. There was considerable friendly intercourse between the Bohemian Brethren and the reformers. De Schweinitz in his *History of the Unitas Fratrum* devotes several chapters to a discussion of this subject. Gindely in his *Quellen zur Geschichte der Boehmischen Brueder* includes many letters exchanged between the Brethren and the Reformers. Luther advised the Brethren in the drawing up of some of their confessions. He expressed great admiration for their system of church discipline.

What would have been the course of events had the lot ruled otherwise we have no way of knowing. At any rate it was a step in the direction of the separation of Moravians from Lutherans, for it seemed to the Count a directive from Providence for the renewal of the church of the Bohemian Brethren. Already the notary's instrument of 1729 reflects the change in Zinzendorf regarding the exiles from Moravia. By this time he had acquired more knowledge of their ancestral church and had begun to see that he had on his hands more than just a problem of maintaining a community of Pietists within Lutheranism. The document was a public acknowledgment of his realization that the Moravians were the heirs of an old established church.

How shall we reconcile Zinzendorf's attempt a year later to drop the discipline and to merge completely with Lutheranism, a complete reversal of policy? Hutton, who in general is a severe critic of Zinzendorf, interprets the action as an illustration of the inconsistency and instability of the Count.[10] Hamilton's interpretation[11] is a more plausible one. In the first instance to have carried out the wish of some that the Brethren drop all attempts to keep a community discipline like that of their forbears would have alienated a large number of the refugees. They probably would have begun to leave Herrnhut immediately.[12]

In the second instance Zinzendorf was thinking of the opposition Herrnhut was arousing in circles near and far. Perhaps he thought the Moravians might be willing to become Lutherans after all. As we have seen, in either case the result was a step nearer to the definite establishment of the Renewed Unity.

Zinzendorf's regard for the powers that be is further shown in his request for a judicial investigation of the activities at Herrnhut. The commission conducted its examination between January 19 and 22 of 1732 and reported most favorably that

---

10. J. E. Hutton, *History of the Moravian Church*, p. 229.
11. J. Taylor Hamilton, *A History of the Church Known As the Moravian Church*, p. 46.
12. Some of the refugees originally had planned to find a home among fellow descendants of the Brethren's Church at that time maintaining their identity within the Reformed Church in Poland. They regarded Herrnhut as a providential intervention in their first intentions. Had the course of events gone counter to their wishes they probably would have continued on to Poland.

nothing illegal was being done. Yet the suspicions of the Count's enemies were not allayed. The opposition more and more began to center its attacks upon Zinzendorf personally. The growing number of refugees as well as the attraction Herrnhut had for separatists soon brought matters to a series of climaxes. Zinzendorf was within a few months after the judicial investigation forbidden to receive more refugees from Austrian territory. In November of 1732 he received an order to sell his property in Upper Lusatia. Fortunately he had anticipated trouble and transferred the title of his holdings to his wife in time to prevent Herrnhut and Berthelsdorf from falling into unfriendly hands.

A related event was the banishment of the Schwenkfelders from the territory, Zinzendorf having been their patron following their earlier banishment from Silesia. The wisdom of the Count's policy with reference to the regulations among the Moravians at Herrnhut is revealed in the fact that while the separatist Schwenkfelders had to leave, the conforming Moravians were permitted to remain. Despite all his troubles the Count was accomplishing a delicate feat, maintaining the identity of a reviving Brethren's Church while keeping them close enough to the state church to stave off restrictive measures. The prohibition of further refugee immigration from Austrian territory to Herrnhut did not come before the group was large enough to ask for their own minister apart from the regular Berthelsdorf parish minister.[13] During this formative period the Moravian element (Moravian refugees) become more distinct rather than less distinct from the purely German Pietist element. The sending forth of the first missionaries to the West Indies on August 21, 1732, likewise proved to be a force in the direction of separation from the state church, for it soon raised the problem of ordination for the mission field. Also it was from the Moravian element at Herrnhut that the greater proportion of the early missionaries were recruited. Their background of poverty and hardship made them particular-

13. A call was extended to Magister Steinhofer of Tuebingen who on a visit to Herrnhut had met with a warm response. He accepted and the university authorities approved. But the Saxon government imposed such restrictions that the negotiations came to nothing. This matter, arising at the time when the need for ordained missionaries was presenting itself, was another factor moving the Moravians to revive their own clerical orders. Hamilton,p. 69.

ly adaptable to the rigors of foreign service.[14]

Zinzendorf had yielded to convention in not becoming a clergyman upon entering upon his life's work. But by 1734 the experiences of the previous decade moved him to follow out his desires by taking clerical orders, after passing theological examinations first at Stralsund and then at Tuebingen. Obviously his strong religious interest was the major factor in this step, but the more immediate occasion was undoubtedly the state of affairs with reference to Herrnhut and its expanding evangelistic, educational and mission activities. As an ordained clergyman he could better lead the various undertakings than by simply acting as lay patron. (The law forbade preaching except by ordained men.) He no doubt believed that the activities of the Herrnhut settlement would be less open to attack if their leader were a properly qualified clergyman. Zinzendorf became a minister to keep his movement closer to the Lutheran Church, or at least part of his movement. We can say "part of his movement," for at this stage it was increasingly clear that the foreign mission branch could not be contained within Lutheranism. On the other hand the numerous societies in fellowship with Herrnhut encouraged the Count in maintaining his inherited Pietistic plan. More and more he looked upon the Moravians as having a specific call for mission service. Three events,[15] as Hutton states, are linked together. As strategic measures he divided the congregation into the Moravian and purely Lutheran section, he had himself ordained, and he established a colony in Georgia. In the extreme event of the Moravians being banished like the Schwenkfelders, Georgia would be a place of refuge. The Count would remain in Herrnhut with his Pietists.

The transfer of the Moravian episcopacy to one of the Herrnhuters, David Nitschmann, a year later seems to accord with this interpretation of the Count's strategy. It was his plan that the reactivated Moravian orders be valid only for the mission field. But even for the mission field Zinzendorf would have preferred

14. A study of Moravian membership in connection with a synod in 1756 revealed that up to that year there had been about 2000 of the Brethren of Bohemian-Moravian birth, of which about 700 were still living. Hamilton, p. 9.

15. *History*, p. 231.

Lutheran orders. There is probably more significance than is generally recognized in his efforts to found a theological seminary on the site of the old cloister of St. George in Wuerttemberg at the same time that he was seeking ordination for himself. Cranz describes the incident thus:

> The state of the case was this. The Moravian Brethren, though very well satisfied with the Lutheran ministry at Berthelsdorf, could no longer remain together at Herrnhut; but began, as we shall soon see, to spread abroad in colonies and missions. They could not everywhere expect such equitable treatment in ecclesiastical matters, as they enjoyed in Upper Lusatia, that ministers should be allowed, or ordained for them, who were according to their own mind, and who, agreeable to the tenor of the Opinion of Tuebingen, would leave them at liberty, together with the evangelical doctrine, to retain the church discipline they had brought with them. From this motive, the count was intent upon providing a sufficient number of candidates for the ministry, that he might be able not only to furnish the Brethren with ministers for their colonies and missions, but also to gratify his friends of the clergy and laity in divers countries, who had solicited him for catechists and domestic tutors. He had, besides, another point of view, which was not the effect of ambition, but was intended only to obviate a certain impropriety. He wished to enter into the clerical order in such a way, as might not, according to the usual way of thinking, reflect any disgrace upon the royal order of Danebrog, conferred upon him by the king of Denmark. Both views he thought to attain, by restoring, at his own expenses, the decayed Protestant cloister of St. George, in the dukedom of Wuertemberg; and, under the character of a prelate of the Wuertemberg church, founding a theological seminary. For this end he caused the question to be put to duke Charles Alexander of Wuertemberg, by Augustus Gottlieb Spangenberg, A. M., who, in 1733, was come from Halle to Herrnhut; and on the 20th of October, 1734, he received the following answer from the headquarters at Heidelberg: "That the duke had all due regard for the count, and for his zeal for the propagation of the kingdom of God. But since both this, and his intention of entering into holy orders, were of an extraordinary nature; his nomination to be a Wuertemberg prelate would attract the attention of the world, and awaken a suspicion against him [the duke] among the Roman Catholics.[16]

16. *History of the Brethren*, pp. 181-182.
In Lutheran Germany ordination carries with it assignment to some specific work in the church, hence Zinzendorf's purpose in tying in his ordination with the cloister restoration project. The fact that Zinzendorf never had a pastorate or other appointment in the church, was the occasion for his enemies challenging the validity of his ordination.

The failure of this project must have convinced Zinzendorf more than ever of the special mission of the Moravians for world-wide service. It certainly widened the breach between Lutherans and Moravians. Hamilton[17] is of the opinion that had Zinzendorf become a prelate of Wuerttemberg, as he sought, the Moravian episcopacy would not have been revived and Lutheran orders would have been imposed upon Herrnhut. Be that as it may, the expanding work of the mission field made it easier for Zinzendorf to reconcile himself to the growing separation. The Moravians had intruded upon his original plans, but now it was plain that the intruders could be channelized into a task also dear to his heart, the conversion of the heathen. Also contact with English Christians gained through negotiations with the projected work in America helped Zinzendorf to appreciate the episcopal form of church government. His fraternal relations with Anglican authorities, particularly Archbishop Potter, were soon to help him to reconcile himself to the revival of the Unitas Fratrum. Potter was among those who in 1737 encouraged the Count to become a Moravian bishop himself.

While Zinzendorf's strategy may have worked well for his followers, it was disastrous to him personally. His becoming a Lutheran clergyman aroused more antagonism than he had anticipated. The transfer of the Moravian episcopacy to the Brethren added fuel to the fire. The Count's banishment from Saxony came on March 20, 1736, the news reaching him in Holland on April 21. The edict assused him of introducing religious novelties, establishing conventicles and teaching false doctrines.[18] The immediate cause back of the edict was a complaint from Baron Huldenberg[19] that many people from his own estates near Herrnhut had been so carried away by the religious institutions of the latter as to move there and become vassals of Zinzendorf. An ironical sequel to the banishment was a second official examina-

---

17. *History*, p. 69.

18. Hutton, I, p. 232.

19. Baron Huldenberg in 1755 had a complete change of heart after visiting Herrnhut. He became reconciled to Zinzendorf and became an admirer. He went so far as to foster Diaspora work among his subjects.

tion of Herrnhut by a commission. This second commission, like the first, was satisfied with the propriety of affairs at Herrnhut and agreed that there were no grounds for deporting of the inhabitants. They were permitted to continue their own peculiar social arrangements as long as they remained loyal to the Augsburg Confession.

Thus the adverse happenings of the seventeen thirties gave impetus to two phases of development, the establishment of the foreign mission enterprises,[20] and the separation of the Moravians from the Lutherans. As a corollary the Count, still holding fast to his ideal of a "Congregation of God in the Spirit," began to develop in his own mind the theoretical framework for it. His own wanderings brought him increasingly into contact with the Reformed and Anglican churches and a variety of Separatists, and he had to fit his concepts into a scheme allowing for a variety of church traditions. It was in this period that his well known "tropus" plan was in formulation, though it was not officially propounded to his followers until the Synod at Marienborn in 1744.[21] Chronologically this coincided roughly with the Mora-

---

20. Upon hearing of his banishment, Zinzendorf said: "I could not have come to Herrnhut, irrespective of this, for the next ten years, to remain there; for we must now gather together the pilgrim-church and preach the Saviour to the world."—Spangenberg, *Life of Count Zinzendorf*, p. 206.

Sessler in his *Communal Pietism*, pp. 15 ff., calls particular attention to the relationship between the political difficulties of the Moravians in Germany and the establishment of their foreign missions. Doubtless there is some causal connection, but not nearly as much as Sessler concludes. Zinzendorf's missionary ideals had been awakened in the Halle school boy and waited only for the occasion to arise to carry them out. The beginning of Moravian Missions could hardly have come earlier, for the church was not sufficiently developed before 1732, the year in which they began.

21. Following the edict of banishment Zinzendorf and his followers in 1737 established in Wetteravia [now Hesse-Darmstadt] a second center of Moravian life. First they leased from the Counts Isenberg two old castles, Ronneberg and Marienborn. Zinzendorf and his pilgrim band lived successively in both of these places. Then in 1738 on the same estate, about four miles from Marienborn, they began building a completely new settlement, modeled after Herrnhut, calling it Herrnhag. Herrnhag was formally organized on July 6, 1740. Soon it surpassed Herrnhut in size. From the start the settlement assumed a much more independent existence than did Herrnhut, having been granted the concession of complete religious liberty. Also, the Reformed element at Herrnhag was conspicuous, and Zinzendorf looked upon the settlement as occupying the same position with reference to the Reformed Church as Herrnhut did to the Lutheran. During the Count's banishment Herrnhag and associated Marienborn were the real center of the Moravian Church, if

vian Church achieving its definite independent status. It was in this general period of time that in the various territories the legal position of the church was defined—Prussia in 1742, Saxony in 1749, and England in 1749. Internally, too, the Brethren organized themselves in conformity to their concept of themselves as a church. At another synod at Marienborn in 1745, following the one at which Zinzendorf propounded the tropus teaching, they organized their ministry pretty much after the pattern of the Bohemian Brethren, with deacons, presbyters and bishops as the three orders, and with acolytes as assistants in the congregation. Elderesses and deaconesses, too, were appointed for the supervision of the females of the church.

The tropus scheme was that which made it possible for Zinzendorf to remain true to his original and continuing ideal. It served not only to maintain the identity of the Moravians, but also the identity of those Lutherans and Reformed who established connections with the Brethren, either by moving to their settlement, or through simple Diaspora connection in their own communities. Spangenberg says that Zinzendorf at the synod of Marienborn went through the whole catalogue of Brethren's elders, teachers, and deacons at home and abroad, and marked down the religious persuasion of each. "In this he had regard to their descendants, and endeavored to prevent any one from being compelled to continue with the Moravians, or that the latter should seek to retain any one who did not act upon their principles."[22] At the same time the tropus idea was more clearly defined by the appointment of bishops for each of the three divisions. The first of these were Polycarp Mueller for the Moravians, Frederick de Watteville for the Reformed, and Zinzendorf himself for the Lutherans (after the Reverend George

---

any place could be called the center, for the executive body, known as the "Pilgrim Band," traveled about freely.

The settlement had to be vacated beginning in 1750 because the government of Isenberg Buedingen laid down impossible terms for the Brethren, following the death of Ernst Casimir the reigning count under whom they had settled there. The extensive educational activities of Herrnhag were transferred to various places and Herrnhut again became the central community of the Moravians.

22. *Life of Zinzendorf*, pp. 341-342.

John Conradi of Schleswig-Holstein had declined because of age). The practice of appointing heads for the respective tropuses continued until 1789 when the synod of that year appointed these officers for the last time.[23]

What existed at the time of the formulation of the tropus principle was theoretically four entities. There were Lutherans, Reformed, Moravians, and the composite body of all three, the last designated simply as Brethren. Actually, however, the Moravian tropus was practically synonomous with the over-all association of Brethren, for it was the Moravian tropus which Zinzendorf looked upon as the embodiment of his ideal community. It was the revived Moravian church constitution and discipline which was the rallying point of the Brethren. It was the Moravians whom Zinzendorf looked upon as specially set apart to be the "Pilgrim" laborers in gathering the ideal community of awakened Christians. What soon happened was that the Moravian tropus became the Renewed Moravian Church.[24] Zinzendorf would have liked to have kept the Moravians inbedded in the over-all association of Brethren. But as we have seen, he was faced with an impossible task from the beginning. Step by Step the reviving church asserted its ecclesiastical individuality. Before Zinzendorf's life had run its course the Unity of Brethren and the Moravian Church could be considered almost identical. Herrnhut and the other Moravian communities had become the symbols and rallying points for a widely dispersed fellowship.

---

23. For practical purposes the tropus scheme remained confined to the Lutheran, Reformed and Moravian divisions. But had the Diaspora program spread beyond the confines of the two Protestant state churches of Germany, Zinzendorf was prepared to include other church divisions in his conception. Thus, for instance, it is recorded in the *Diarium der Huetten* of September 30, 1749, that he counts seven tropuses, Lutheran, Reformed, Moravian, Mennonite, Anglican, Neophytes, and members of the Pilgrim Congregation, the last two being mainly converts from the heathen world and evangelists and servants for the whole. For a comprehensive discussion of the tropus teaching see Mueller's *Zinzendorf als Erneurer der Alten Bruederkirche*, pp. 84-95, and Becker's *Zinzendorf und Sein Christentum im Verhaeltnis zum Kirchkichen und Religiosen Leben Seiner Zeit*, pp. 496-506.

24. It is to be noted that among the Germans where the Diaspora ideal continues strong the church is known as the Brueder Gemeine. In England and America where the denominational ideal ultimately triumphed the church is known as the Moravian Church.

CHAPTER II

The Establishment of the Diaspora

Of the two consuming ambitions of Zinzendorf, the spiritual union of Christians and the evangelization of the heathen, the latter has been more dramatized by church historians. Yet Zinzendorf put more thought and effort into the Diaspora than into foreign missions. At any rate, Diaspora activity began some years before the sending forth of the first missionaries in 1732. His high estimate of the Diaspora is strongly stated in a sermon to a gathering of 600 Diaspora adherents at Herrnhut less than two years before his death:

> I would rather be a Diaspora peasant than a messenger to the heathen. A true brother and sister among the scattered ones, a heart of Jesus in the midst of the world is the greatest martyr. . . . He must deny himself much; he dare not live free and lax. . . . If with grace of heart, accuracy, punctuality, and purification of the vessel from the outside is anywhere necessary, it is in the Diaspora. Many eyes look upon the Diaspora brethren, every step which they take, every expression which they make is noticed.[1]

From all the evidence noted thus far it is clear that the impetus for the Diaspora was the Count's own view of Christianity and the Church. Though he was one of the outstanding ecumenically minded men of his generation, believing passionately in the oneness of all true Christians, his was not a belief in the organic union of different church bodies, or even a belief in a federal union. His conviction was that the unity of Christians is a fact transcending differing church confessions. That which ties believers together is their "heart religion." This is the same regardless of the particular church in which membership is held. Zinzendorf takes the position that the union of Christians already exists. Therefore our duty is simple to "gather" the awakened Christians.[2] Speaking to a conference of workers in the year 1745 Zinzendorf says:

---

1. "Juengerhaus Diarium," June 25, 1758.
2. As Bauer says: "It is really a narrowing of his thought to say that he wished to establish the unity of the Children of God. No, for him that unity is already there." "Das Diasporawerk der Bruedergemeine," an article in *Zeitschrift Zur Bruedergeschichte*, I, 1911, p. 125.

> I have the irenian idea that all Children of God in all confessions are one and work for the same end. For over thirty years my aim has been that all may be one in the Lord. I regard no Christianity well substantiated without oneness of spirit.[3]

To awaken souls, to gather them, to foster their spiritual life was his consuming ambition, and in which he set a personal example for his followers. The tropus framework which he worked out was his device for accomplishing this aim without blurring the individuality of the various churches. The Count did not believe in a union based upon the melding of creeds or of ceremonies. This he felt would result either in confusion or a watered down religion, or both. He said:

> The question is not one of forms and ceremonies, or the adoption of certain practices which are peculiar to each land, but the question is one of the heart, in matters pertaining to which all children of God must be one. Therefore it is urgent upon me that the Saviour may everywhere gather more true people to Himself.[4]

On another occasion he said that when members come into the Brethren's fellowship he wants Lutherans to remain Lutherans, and Reformed to remain Reformed. Nor would he want Mennonites to bring their children to the Brethren for baptism. He firmly believed that a person's religious background so determined his point of view that if he changed his church allegiance, such a one would be a misfit. Heart religion alone is the common element.[5]

The religious activities which became the Moravian Diaspora antedate the Renewed Moravian Church, being the travels and correspondence of awakened Pietists. The Order of the Grain of Mustard Seed already organized by the teen age Halle school boy was a part of this beginning. So were the religious services of the young Count during his first year in the Saxon capital in 1721. It was this same religious outreach which brought Zinzendorf into contact with Christian David the leader of the first exiles to Herrnhut. The Covenant of the Four Brethren—Zinzendorf, de Watteville, Schaeffer and Rothe—was a significant step in the building of the Diaspora.

---

3. "Marienborn Conference," 1745, MS in Bethlehem Archives.
4. "Juengerhaus Diarium," November 23, 1757.
5. "Diarium der Huetten," June 15, 1750.

Evangelistic work and the rise of societies outside of Herrnhut began within a few years following the founding of this first center of the Renewed Church. The beginnings were purely spontaneous and without plan, the first leaders scarcely knowing what they were doing in conducting informal religious services for groups here and there. Zinzendorf himself said, "The Diaspora was not made; it just came to be."[6] Again he says: The Saviour has given us no prescribed methods after which we should lead souls. The Saviour has kept the leading Himself, and His servants must conduct themselves after His spirit's direction. There are no methods or ground principles to bind oneself to."[7]

The name Diaspora as applied to this phase of the Brethren's work came almost a generation later. Officially the term was first used at a synod in London in September of 1749, though the word had come into use before that. A communication from a civic official in Goerlitz near Herrnhut, for instance, dated April 3, 1737, refers disparagingly to the conduct of certain Herrnhut minded persons in "the Diaspora."[8] The word also appears in the proceedings of the Synod of Gotha in 1740. However, up to the time of the above London synod the designation, Diaspora, had only more or less local significance with reference to nearby friends of Moravians.

Prior to 1749, and for some time after, different names had been used to designate friends of the Church who were not of her membership. Among these were "auswaertige Geschwister," "Stiefbrueder," "Cousins," "Gesellschaften aus allerlei Gegenden," "verbundene Haeuflein," "verbundene Gesellschafter," "auswaertige Geschwister und Freunde." Why the name Diaspora was chosen in 1749 is not clear. Steinecke ventures to say that the changed political situation was probably the deciding factor. In 1749 the Moravians became an independent ecclesiastical body in Saxony. Prior to this time its members were still technically of the same communion as those of the state church. Therefore the distinction between members and like-minded friends was not so clearly defined. But upon the Church achieving a separate

6. Steinecke, *Die Diaspora der Bruedergemeine*, I, p. 66.
7. *Barbysche Samlungen*, p. 102.
8. Steinecke, I, p. 4.

corporate existence the distinction was accentuated. There were only a few congregations, and friends too far away to join these congregations found themselves of a different denomination. Hence the designation of these as Diaspora members. But we do know that it was slow in catching on, complaints being voiced that it was confusing and often misinterpreted. The matter was discussed at a synod as late as 1782, at which it was resolved that the term "Non-Resident Brethren and Sisters and Friends" (auswaertige Geschwister und Freunden) be henceforth used.[9] But apparently the word Diaspora prevailed anyway and continues to the present.

Moravian literature, beginning in the latter part of the nineteenth century, has increasingly been using the word "Gemeinschaftspflege" for the Diaspora. The reason, according to H. Bauer writing in 1910 is that the term Diaspora today also refers to Protestant evangelicals who live in predominantly Roman Catholic countries.[10] Hence for Moravians to refer to scattered members within Protestant state churches implies judgment upon the latter. It makes Diaspora members appear anti-church to many people. So frequently one sees reports under the general heading of Diaspora with "Gemeinschaftspflege" in parentheses.

There is no isolated event which we can strictly say is the beginning of the Moravian Diaspora. Nevertheless the various forces at work served to precipitate an incident on August 17, 1727, which Steinecke says we may so single out if we must do so.[11] Almost immediately after its beginning Herrnhut evoked the interest of evangelical Christians far and wide. Visitors were numerous. Among them were members of nearby parishes. Such active interest in the services at Herrnhut aroused opposition on the part of some of the pastors of these parishes. Jealousy was undoubtedly involved, but there was, too, the sincere fear of religious confusion. According to the Herrnhut diary[12] of August 17, 1727, several members of the church at neighboring

9. An appendix to the synodal proceedings of 1782 issued by the Unity's Elders' Conference, 1783, paragraph 811. MS in Moravian Archives.
10. H. Bauer, *Ueberblick Ueber die Gemeinschaftspflege der Bruedergemeine*, p. 1.
11. *Die Diaspora*, I, p. 69.
12. Cited by Steinecke, I, p. 68.

Seifhennersdorf came to Herrnhut early in the morning to report that they had been forbidden under penalty of the law to attend services in the Berthelsdorf-Herrnhut parish. In response to this report, on the very same day, two Herrnhuters, Gottlieb Wried and Jacob Neisser, went to Seifhennersdorf and upon arriving there conducted a well attended service (presumably in a private home). During the course of the meeting they were arrested and sent off to the prison at Zittau. Undaunted by this rebuff, Zinzendorf himself, accompanied by a fellow Herrnhuter named Kuehnel, went to Seifhennersdorf and there conducted a service on August 25. He did the same not long after at Oderwitz. Within a few months numerous similar groups were holding meetings. Steinecke points to these events as the definite beginning of the Moravian Diaspora, since Wried and Neisser were the first two actually to be sent out by Herrnhut on such a mission.

Apparently the Herrnhuters considered themselves within their rights in holding services at home for visitors. One of the early features of the religious life of the settlement was a Sunday afternoon hour at which the Sunday morning sermon of Rothe in the parish church at Berthelsdorf was repeated by Zinzendorf or some other capable layman. This was primarily for those who had been unable to attend the morning service. But it was also open to visitors who soon were frequenting it in such great number that by 1729 it came to be known as the *Fremdenstunde* (Strangers' Hour).[13] In contrast was the Gemeinstunde in the evening primarily for the edification of the members who were assured of their relationship to the Saviour. Though certainly not so intended, the visitors' hour, which continued spasmodically for a number of years, resulted in some accessions to Moravian membership.

With amazing rapidity the itinerant evangelists had established a network of little societies throughout Germany and beyond. An enumeration of representative agents and communities to which they went gives one a fair conception of what took place in those first two or three years. On September 27 the abovementioned Gottlieb Wried, together with Andrew Beyer, set out

13. Hamilton, p. 43.

upon an itinerancy which took in Lichtenstein, Kalditz, Kostritz, Jena, Saalfeld and Bayreuth. On this journey they made contact with Professor Buddeus of Jena and Prince Christian Ernest of Saalfeld. At Jena, Beyer made a deep impression upon the young student August Gottlieb Spangenberg, which was to have far-reaching consequences. Spangenberg was destined to be a Moravian leader second only to Zinzendorf during the next half century. Great interest was aroused among the students at Jena in the Moravian movement and several years later a considerable number of these joined the church and entered its ministry.

Christian David and David Nitschmann (consecrated as the first bishop of the Renewed Moravian Church in 1735) itinerated in Austrian territory. Andrew Beyer after returning from his first extensive visits, set out again, this time to Teschen in Silesia. Augustine Neisser went to Sorau, Hungary. Melchior Nitschmann and George Schmidt visited Moravia in 1728. There they were imprisoned and Nitschmann, still in prison, died the following year. Schmidt, after six years of confinement, was released and became one of the pioneer missionaries in Africa. Wencelaus Neisser, John Toeltschig and David Nitschmann (the Syndic) were sent to England in order to establish a connection with the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge. Not accomplishing this objective, they did, nevertheless, make a contact with a friend of Zinzendorf, Countess Lippe-Schaumberg, which indirectly led to the work of the Moravian Church in the British Isles a decade later. Melchior Zeizberger was delegated to visit Stockholm. Christian David, already mentioned as itinerating in Austria, and Timothy Fiedler in 1729 made the first visit to the Baltic provinces, the prelude to the largest Diaspora field numerically. Enroute to Riga and Reval, David and Fiedler stopped in Berlin to visit Daniel Ernest Jablonski, Reformed court preacher and grandson of John Amos Comenius. Jablonski, though a Reformed clergyman, had been consecrated a Moravian bishop in 1699, and at this time was one of the two surviving bishops of the Ancient Brethren's Church. Additional regions and cities visited by these brethren and by others not mentioned were Salzburg, Pommerania, Wuerttemberg, Switzerland, the

Palatinate. Certainly the coverage was extensive.[14]

Nor was the Count himself content to remain in one place. In 1727, accompanied by several of the immigrants from Moravia, he visited Thuringia. In 1726 he went to Berleberg and made repeated visits to Jena where he organized a Christian union of students as a sequel to the response evoked by the earlier visit of Wried and Beyer. Zinzendorf also maintained active personal contact with Halle and other centers of learning and piety. He established a printing office in Ebersdorf, from which place went forth in all directions pamphlets, letters, and inexpensive editions of the Bible.[15]

Personal contacts were followed up with a vigorous program of correspondence. Steinecke taking sample notations from the Herrnhut diary reveals that at times the mail would bring 100-150 letters in a single day. Postage for this project amounted to over one hundred fifty dollars a year. The reading of such letters became a practice at informal services. The localities concerned are evidence that in those first years the Diaspora was like a net spread far and wide over the Protestant lands of Europe.[16]

It is apparent that this type of activity does not lend itself well to numerical accounting. Many of the Brethren disdained to bother about noting the number in their fellowship groups. Yet we do know from the number of Diaspora workers involved and from the approximate size of the societies that the project grew to be very extensive within a decade. By the end of 1732 there were more than fifty brethren and sisters in Diaspora service. About half of these were married couples working as a team. The others were unmarried. In 1735 the estimated number of Diaspora members in the Herrnhut neighborhood alone was 1000. In 1738, as revealed in a conference in Berlin, there were Diaspora societies in eighty-eight different places on the continent and in England, of which sixty-one were in Germany.

At a synod at Marienborn, Wetteravia, in 1745 a total of 159 societies were reported.[17] These were classified according to their

14. Hamilton, pp. 45-46.
15. Hutton, pp. 204-205.
16. *Die Diaspora*, I, pp. 69-70.
17. "Minutes of the Marienborn Synod," 1745, MS in Moravian Archives.

church affiliations as follows: Lutheran, 88; Reformed, 38; Moravian, 30; and unnamed, 3. At a synod in Zeist in the following year it was reported that the Brethren's Church "stood in connection" with 540 communities exclusive of the Baltic states.[18]

It is to be noted in reading these figures that the Diaspora was not everywhere formally organized. In general there were these classifications: individual members, or at most, individual families in communities where the number of people was insufficient for organization; small groups who met at stated meetings, but who were not organized; and, finally, fully organized societies. The figure of 159 societies, reported at the Wetteravian synod is for the last classification. The much larger figure of the 1746 synod at Zeist refers to communities in which there were Diaspora members of all classifications. Discrepancies in reports, which are to be noted in the sources, obviously are due to different bases of reporting.

Zinzendorf's troubles with the authorities in Saxony, culminating in his banishment, seemed to be of little effect on the over-all picture of Diaspora work. To be sure, during the eleven years of the Count's exile from Saxony the work there was restricted. The settlement at Herrnhut itself was permitted to go about its business undisturbed, but the surrounding Diaspora societies were forbidden to continue by a conventicle mandate of 1737. Also, members of neighboring parishes were forbidden under penalty to attend services at Herrnhut and Berthelsdorf.

Apparently this had only a temporarily discouraging effect for upon the revocation of the edict of Zinzendorf's banishment in 1747 followed by the recognition of the Brethren in 1749 by the Saxon government as a legally established church, and not merely a tolerated sect, the Diaspora societies soon revived. By 1754 in the immediate vicinity of Herrnhut there were again already 500 Diaspora Brethren. Also, during the time of restricted activity in Saxony the Moravian Church established itself, both in the

18. "Minutes of the Zeist Synod," 1746, p. 132, MS in Moravian Archives.

form of societies and of settlements.[19] Generally throughout Germany there were restrictions upon extra-church religious meetings, but the strict enforcement of them depended pretty much upon the attitude of the local magistrates and pastors. The Brethren here and there experienced opposition to their work, but by exercising caution over against the national churches they were able to move freely throughout Germany. The same situation was true generally of the other countries of northern Europe.

Two notable exceptions were restrictive measures imposed upon the Moravians in the Baltic states in 1743 and in Sweden in 1751, as described in the chapters dealing with those countries. Yet even there the Brethren managed to continue their activity because of the more or less amorphous nature of their work. Their's was an influence, a way of life and thought, beyond the reach of police action. One could be a Herrnhuter inwardly at least even where the law forbade the overt expression of it.

Before proceeding further with the ongoing external growth of the Diaspora we must pause to examine its internal development. Since the work was so strongly rooted in Pietism, with the beginnings antedating the Renewed Moravian Church itself, the general procedure was already in the minds of the Brethren when they began their itinerant ministries. Then too, the state with its controls, such as the prohibition of preaching on the part of the unordained, its supervision of doctrine, its disapproval of anything resembling separation, helped further to set the style for the Diaspora program. The Moravians were quite content to continue the nurture of an intra-church piety. It is interesting to observe that though the problem of remaining or not remaining within the national church arose with reference to the settlements, it seems seldom to have arisen in the early days in connection with the Diaspora.

The first Diaspora evangelists, like the first foreign missionaries, went forth without any training and even without any

19. The settlements founded during this period were Marienborn-Herrnhag in Wetteravia, 1737; Gnadenberg in Silesia, 1743, and Neusalz in the same province, 1744; Ebersdorf in Thuringia, 1744; Haarlem and Zeist in Holland, 1744 and 1746 respectively; and, surprisingly, Niesky in Saxony, 1742. The congregation in Berlin was founded in 1744, thus also belonging to this period, but it never was a settlement congregation.

formal instructions.[20] A common procedure was for Zinzendorf himself to give the instructions personally and to write a travel letter couched in general terms. The first such letter was for Beyer and Wried, written under date of September 22, 1727:

> Since the dear Herrnhut congregation has found it desirable that you go out to preach the merits of Him who has called you, so go forth in the peace of the Lord. The Lord be with you everywhere in blessing. May he break forth ahead of you and let you break through. Freely have you received; freely give. Do not go only to one place, but openly in the day wander along the streets called righteousness. Acknowledge your King freely and courageously. About us and the blessing among us speak in accord with your convictions, but meekly. Do not seek opinions and sectarianism, though you are not commanded to shun the discourses of such material. Listen to what each has to say. Test everything and retain the good. Seek everywhere only those in all churches who after Luke 6 have dug deeply and found Jesus to be the only one. Do not be satisfied with proud words, but seek after power. Next I bury you in the heart of the love of Jesus and am eternally your fellow fighter Zinzendorf.[21]

In similar vein the Count writes such a letter for Christian David under date of March 4, 1732:

> Whoever has the spirit of fellowship and the spirit of testing things will know and love and nurture him in all activities in which he has need. Gold and silver he needs not. But what he needs in the realm of spiritual things give to him in the name of the Lord. Have open hearts toward him and remember the unworthy though saved fellow members in Herrnhut.[22]

The Diaspora personnel offered themselves voluntarily. Following this the lot was used to determine where the journey should lead. After 1732, the year of the beginning of foreign

---

20. The Moravians for nearly a century and a half considered special training for mission service unnecessary. Most of their ministers on the home field had a theological education, but this was not the case with those on the foreign field. Unless they happened to be ministers called from service at home or former teachers in the boarding schools of the church, the missionaries as a rule were of the artisan class. Several synods of the church considered the proposal of establishing a mission college but always rejected it. Finally in 1869 the Unity Elders' Conference opened such a school at Niesky, Silesia. This school continued its work until World War II.

Missionaries from America on the other hand have usually received the same education in the Moravian College and Theological Seminary at Bethlehem as have the ministers in the home congregations. The mission school at Niesky has also furnished a small number of Diaspora workers. For an account of this subject see J. E. Hutton, *A History of Moravian Missions*. pp. 480-481.

21. Cited by Steinecke, I, p. 44.

22. *Ibid.*, pp. 44-45.

missions, the lot was frequently used to decide whether the candidate for service should be used in the foreign or in the Diaspora mission service. The first generation did a great deal of itinerating, as already noted, often not determining the itinerancy in advance. But within two or three decades territories became defined and membership in the societies more or less stabilized. With the work coming to be divided into districts, the Diaspora representative took up residence as nearly as possible in the geographic center of his district, making his rounds in a manner similar to the circuit riding preachers of frontier America, though without exercising the preaching function. As itinerancy gave way to more settled residence married couples replaced single brethren.

The early ideal was for the Diaspora brother to earn his living by the pursuit of a trade as he made his rounds. This was quite natural since so many of the Moravian brethren were craftsmen—carpenters, cobblers, weavers, potters, tailors, etc. Not only was this an advantage financially, for otherwise the small home community could not have sent out so many evangelists, but also it was a means of getting closer to the rank and file of the people.[23]

A typical Diaspora evangelist of the first generation was Konrad Lange whose life is briefly reviewed in an 1866 edition of the Moravian Church paper of the German province:

> In 1738 he with his wife went on his pilgrim journey. They took their little daughter and baggage with them on a pushcart, from which the company was called the "Little Pilgrim Wheel." Everywhere he went he stuck to his resolve to earn his living as a tailor in order not to be a burden upon anyone in proclaiming the Gospel. First he remained three months in Halle; then in Gotha and Langensalza. From there he visited Erfurt and surrounding communities. Then he proceeded to Bockenheim in Wetteravia, in order to serve Frankfurt and Hanau. During 1739-1740 he made his headquarters in Wuerttemberg and visited the awakened in Stuttgart, Ragold, Reutlingen and other places. After a lengthy stay in Augsburg he lived eventually nine months at Fuerth and served Nueremberg, Ansbach, Erlangen and Neustadt simultaneously. From here his pilgrimage during 1742 took him past Ebersdorf and Herrnhut to

23. This was especially a favorite pattern of Zinzendorf, and which he called the "Anachoreten Plan." He held this ideal up to Diaspora members as he addressed them from time to time.

> Zaparowa near Lissa [Poland] to work among immigrant Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. Here, due to a missionary appointment his first pilgrim journey came to an end.[24]

The same account carries a quotation from Lange himself on the requirements for Diaspora work:

> One must not come with an aggressive spirit. [Arbeitergeist] In the congregation it might be acceptable that one strives, but not in the Diaspora. There one must follow the sign of the Holy Spirit, stand in intercourse with the Martyr Man, have a priestly, liturgical behaviour, be everyman's servant, strive with no one, but be sincere and joyful with all men. Where factions and parties are, there one is a child of peace. One does not align himself with any party, but one seeks to bring the various sentiments to the fundamentals, to the merits and death of Jesus, through which all sectarianism disappears by itself.[25]

The Moravian method stands in sharp contrast to its Methodist counterpart in England. The Count had little regard for mass evangelism. He referred to the thousands in attendance at English revival meetings as a mob. He regarded such a phenomenon as a grand spectacle rather than as a receiving of the word of God. He warned against pressing for conversion, advising his workers to wait for the Holy Spirit to do His work.

The nature of the typical Diaspora gathering during these early years was in line with the Count's aversion to competing with the established church. He was deeply concerned lest the meetings assume the nature of anti-church conventicles. There were to be no original sermons lest some member set himself up as a rival minister alongside of the parish minister. Read sermons, therefore, were a common feature of the meetings. Conspicuous among these were Zinzendorf's *Berlin Addresses*, his speeches at Berthelsdorf, in Pennsylvania and at various other Moravian centers. Memoirs of spiritually mature Brethren and Sisters, news of the religious life in the settlement congregations, reports from the mission field, all these were used for the edification of those present. Common were testimonials, prayers, questions concerning the week's sermon in the church. Perhaps above all as a source

---

24. *Bruederbote*, 1866, p. 76. The missionary appointment referred to was a call to Mongolia. While enroute Lange and two other missionaries were imprisoned in Russia, being confined until 1747. Following his release Lange resumed his Diaspora work. He died in Frankfurt in 1767.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 77.

of inspiration were the Christocentric hymns being composed prolifically by Pietists of the period. Many of them were written by the Count himself. Simplicity, informality, warmth, the sharing of experience, characterized the nature of the Diaspora service from the beginning and have been its features ever since.

Zinzendorf's concept of the Diaspora as a purely spiritual fellowship moved him to avoid the more intellectual aspects of Christian expression which tended to divide people. So concerning the Diaspora services he says:

> The people should only sing, pray and talk with one another. What goes beyond the discussion of Christian experience is offensive. For with religious addresses without pastors the people bring much poorer goods to market than in the church, and therewith comes pride.[26]

In line with the Count's aversion to sermons in Diaspora meetings was his attitude toward Bible study. He was a firm believer in the Bible as a devotional book and as a guide for daily Christian living. However, he objected to attempts at Biblical interpretation and exposition on the part of the layman. Hence there was little of this in Moravian circles outside of the regular church services.[27]

Where there existed a large enough group to make organization possible the Diaspora services were frequently divided into separate gatherings for married couples, single brethren, single sisters, boys and girls, according to the Moravian choir system. Each division had a regularly appointed leader. This was especially the case in the Baltic states, in a few cases in Sweden, and in Switzerland. However, since this tended to give undue prominence to the Moravian aspects of the Diaspora, the Count frowned upon it. This was more of a development after Zinzendorf's lifetime.

It must be borne in mind that many of the Diaspora adherents were scattered individuals or single families who were not able to participate in the meetings. As many as could be were reached through the personal visitation of the itinerant workers. In between such visits the Moravian contact was through literature and correspondence.

---

26. Cited by Bauer in "Das Diasporawerk der Bruedergemeine," in *Zeitschrift fuer Bruedergeschichte*, 1911, p. 143.
27. Uttendorf, Otto, *Zinzendorf's Gedanken ueber den* Gottesdienst, pp. 27-37.

As the Diaspera societies multiplied many of the members began to express a desire to become full-fledged members of the Moravian Church. This was permitted to only a limited number, and only after a long period of waiting. Frequently the lot was resorted to for a final decision. It was Zinzendorf's conviction that a scattered Diaspora membership was more effective in Christian influence than a concentrated membership in a few localities.

> The more the awakened are scattered, the better it is; then their influence extends over a wide area. The ordinary way of the Saviour with the Diaspora is not that they here and there all sit on a pile. Where the believers all congregate in one community, there the rest of Christendom lapses. Where the children of God remain scattered in the churches, there they exercise a definite influence upon the ministers. For that reason the gathering of the people in one place is frowned upon.[28]

The development of the Renewed Church into an independent body in no wise diminished Zinzendorf's high regard for the state church, of which fact his tropus teaching is evidence. Alongside of the basic principle of loyalty to the state church is that of discouraging Diaspora members from becoming Moravians in the denominational sense. "The tropuses should not strengthen the congregation, but should keep many thousands out of the congregation, who are also children of God."[29]

There was a two-fold reason for this caution in admitting people to Moravian membership. Uppermost was Zinzendorf's concern about not giving offense to the state pastors. But caution was also necessary for the good of the Brethren themselves. The influx of a large number of religious enthusiasts would have created a serious problem for the settlement congregations in their attempt to live a secluded life of quiet piety.[30] But perhaps even more of a factor in discouraging the growth of the Moravian Church was the fact that Zinzendorf, though reconciled to the renewal of the

---

28. "Juengerhaus Diarium," April 7, 1760.
29. *Barbysche Sammlungen*—Excerpts from an address to workers in 1740, p. 186.
30. We note the difficulties of Herrnhut during its first five years prior to the statutes of 1727. The diverse elements in the struggle of adjusting themselves to one another almost broke up the community. The excesses of the sifting period during the seventeen forties in Herrnhag were aggravated by the accession of many Pietist extremists.

Moravian organization, never accepted it wholeheartedly. The sequence of events led him to believe that the renewal was providential, but he did not conclude from this that the Lord intended it to be permanent.

> I wish to establish churches [Gemeine] of Jesus Christ in every place, not Moravian congregations. If because of the apostolic succession, and because we preach the Saviour, they wish to make Herrnhuters out of us, we will bear this shame. But that could cease and be forgotten in fifty years, so that nothing except the church of Christ would remain. We have through force of circumstances been made a church because all theologians together pushed us away with stove pokers and would have nothing to do with us. We sought thirteen or fourteen years to remain under the wings of the Lutheran Church, but they would not have us.[31]

Zinzendorf wished the Diaspora to be in union with Herrnhut only in a spiritual sense. He warned against observing Moravian festivals, lovefeasts, cup of covenant services, footwashings, etc.[32]in imitation of Herrnhut, lest these be obstacles to participation in the regular church life of the community. The principle was that the Diaspora have the Moravian spirit without the outer form. Diaspora members were forbidden to have their own communion services, lest this give offense. The nearest thing to their standing apart from the church was that in some communities they attended communion services in a body in the state church.

The background of the Renewed Moravian Church was such that in the carrying out of the evangelistic aims of the Diaspora loyalty to the state church, whether it be the Reformed or the Lutheran, was almost inevitable. This same attitude, we shall see, characterized the Brethren with reference to the Establishment in Britain. Zinzendorf in the face of all of his troubles with ecclesiastical authorities remained a conformist. "I will not separate myself from my Brethren after the flesh, those of the outward body of religion. I will remain in connection with them. I will work for their best interests because the Saviour has allowed

---

31. Uttendorfer and Schmidt, *Die Brueder*, p. 178.

32. Beginning about the middle of the eighteenth century Moravians in their settlement congregations practiced the custom of footwashing at certain special services, especially on Maundy Thursday. This was never done at a public service, but only at the respective choir services. The General Synod of 1818 abolished the custom and it is nowhere practiced today.

me to be born and reared in their midst.[33] Again we note his words in a communication to the "awakened souls" of Erfurt under date of May 18, 1738: "I entreat my Brethren in childlike fashion to become artless toward Jesus, real churchly, inwardly loving and trusted friends of the upright pastors, their companions in prayer, and their fellow workers."[34] In a speech on June 22, 1750 the Count says:

> The Diaspora should especially not affect anything new or unaccustomed, but in all quietness conduct themselves according to their church organization, and to be distinguished from their neighbors by nothing else than the quality of their spiritual life, so that everything the Brethren do proceeds from their hearts in their church life as well as in their life in society.[35]

A blot upon the Moravians during these early years was the "Sifting Time," falling largely between 1745 and 1750 and centering in the settlements in Wetteravia. Since the effect in Diaspora circles was most marked in Sweden, the discussion of this has been reserved for that chapter.[36] Suffice it to say at this point that its influence reached throughout all the church and into the mission fields, drawing upon the Moravians ridicule and opposition. Of all the controversial literature against the Moravians during the lifetime of Zinzendorf, the bulk of it falls in this general period of time.[37] In defense of the Brethren it may be noted that in part they were reflecting the age in which they lived. Sentimentalism in religion, art literature, manners, was a characteristic of the mid-eighteenth century.

In the somewhat more than three decades from its beginning to the death of Zinzendorf we see a pattern established for the Diaspora. The growth was spontaneous and yet always under the careful direction of the Count. This was to characterize the Diaspora through subsequent generations. It remained a movement for the encouragement of free religious expression, but carefully watched by its leaders to keep it within the bounds of the established church.

---

33. "Diarium der Huetten," June 12, 1755.
34. *Theologische Bedenken*, Buedingen, 1742, p. 113.
35. "Diarium der Huetten," June 22, 1750.
36. See Chapter VII, pp. 112-143
37. See Chapter IX in Malin's *Catalogue of Moravian Books*, Philadelphia, 1881, pp. 73-88.

CHAPTER III

From Zinzendorf to the Close of the Eighteenth Century

The imprint of Zinzendorf was so indelibly stamped upon the Brethren that his passing made little difference to any phase of the church's activity. Since it was the Count personally who so strongly repressed the impulse to denominationalize, it would be quite understandable had this tendency asserted itself more strongly after his death. But such is not the case. The Diaspora spirit continued in full vigor and the Brethren shaped their program accordingly. To be sure, there was some loss of spontaneity, but no more than one would expect at this stage of development. Not only was a dynamic genius no longer on hand to direct affairs, but also the brotherhood was old enough by this time to require more systematic formulations. To Zinzendorf's immediate successors fell the task of consolidation. This they carried out with remarkable fidelity to their late leader's wishes. It is hard to see where Zinzendorf would have done things any differently had he lived a decade or two longer.

The resolutions of the conferences and synods of the post-Zinzendorf era contain little that is new and simply re-echo the founder's ideas. "The Diaspora," reads an excerpt of the *Juengerhaus Diarium* of March 10, 1761, "is a basic thought of the heart of Jesus." The committee of the Lutheran Tropus of June 12, 1764, declares, "The Brethren's Church has the apostolic commission to preach the Saviour in all the world and especially among the Protestant churches." The minutes of the Synod of 1764 carry this item:

> When a brother comes into the congregation (Gemeine) from a religion (a common Zinzendorfian term for church, particularly the national churches) he does not go into a new church, but he retains his rights in the religion in which he was reared, and it remains for him an object of love and and remembrance before the Lord. Should he be used outside of the congregation in the service of his church, he can still retain unharmed his privileges in the congregation.
>
> The blessed disciple (Zinzendorf) had the concept that in such a fashion religious disputes in the congregation would be diminished.[1]

1. "Minutes of the Synod of 1764," MS in Moravian Archives.

This same synod, together with the two following ones of 1769 and 1775 respectively, laid the ground work for a church constitution which remained essentially in effect until 1857 when an era of provincial autonony was inaugurated. In the polity set-up the Diaspora is recognized as one of the major tasks of the Brethren.

At the time of the Synod of 1789, a full generation after Zinzendorf, the Brethren are regretfully aware of the prevalence of rationalism in the national churches and feel that it is their calling to counteract it. Yet they reassert their esteem for the national churches and warn against deserting them.

> The Brethren's Church is no distinct religion, but a gathering of such people who are living members of the body of Christ, and God's purposes for the Brethren's Church are that we spread the good news of the love of God everywhere with all our means and that we become a good salt among the Christian churches. . . . To be sure, the churches are not the living congregations of God, but we will not take hold of and preach the bad in the church. We will let them stand as long as the Saviour lets them stand, will love the good in them and pray for them, try to bring into them a good leaven and enlarge the strength that is still in them and serve them through God's grace wherever we have opportunity.[2]

Moravian leadership continued to be aware of the problem inherent in the type of religion represented by their church, namely, that zeal and separatism invariably go hand in hand. The Diaspora has done a remarkably good work of retaining experiential Christianity within the state church. This has not been accomplished without repeated admonitions. Typical is another excerpt from the minutes of the Synod of 1789:

> Do not fall also into the misfortune of many awakened people who give themselves to peculiar ideas and seek to spread them. We have so much to learn in the teachings of the Gospel, so much to enjoy, so many vital and necessary points, over which to pray, weep and give thanks, that one justly shuns the unspiritual and loose talk, and remains by the teachings of the atonement.[3]

The rationalism of the latter half of the century served to swell the membership and attendance of the societies of the Moravians, for dissatisfied with the coldness of the national churches, many

2. "Minutes of the Synod of 1789," MS in Moravian Archives.
3. *Ibid.*

found in the spiritually warm, informal, simple services of the Herrnhuters the heart religion they were seeking. The thirty years from the death of Zinzendorf to about the beginning of the last decade of the century was the golden age of the Diaspora. Though the work continued at a high level during the closing years, the disturbances emanating from the French Revolution had their adverse effects here and there.

Relative to the decline of Pietism the Brethren themselves make this observation at one of their synods: "The name Pietist has ceased; everything which is not of the world is called Herrnhuter."[4] In northern Germany Moravians generally speaking became the heirs of Halle during this period. In southern Germany Wuerttemberg came to be an important center of Moravian work, though it did not have a settlement congregation until 1807. Late in the century the Scandinavian Diaspora was perhaps as flourishing as it ever was before or since. In Denmark the settlement congregation of Christiansfeld had been established in 1773, giving impetus to interest in Moravianism. In Sweden and Norway the work remained entirely on the Diaspora basis. Negotiations in 1786-1787 for the founding of a Moravian settlement in the former had failed because of political reasons. In Norway there never was an attempt at a congregation. The extensive work in the Baltic provinces was flourishing in a quiet way despite hampering legal restrictions.

Attempts to measure the Diaspora numerically remain only approximations. An estimate for the year 1775 is 30,000 actual members, of whom about half were in Germany, Holland, Switzerland, Hungary, and the Scandinavian countries, and the other half in Baltic Russia.[5] But already in 1761 a statement in the *Juengerhaus Diarium* had noted that the number of folks "who stand upon the same ground as the Brethren's Church is between thirty and forty thousand."[6] Obviously this refers more to a circle of influence than to membership. Steinecke says that in 1769 there were eight hundred communities in Germany alone where Diaspora work was carried on.[7] The number of Diaspora

4. "Synod of Berthelsdorf, 1756," cited by Steinecke, p. 75.
5. G. Burkhardt, *Die Bruedergemeine*, p. 99.
6. "Juengerhaus Diarium," March 10, 1761.
7. *Die Diaspora*, I, p. 75.

workers was listed as 170 and the estimated membership twenty to twenty-five thousand. By this time most of the agents were married Brethren and their wives are included in the number of workers. More often the reports included only the Diaspora agent himself. At the Herrnhut Diaspora conference of 1785 forty-four, or about half, of the full-time field staff were in attendance. It was estimated that these represented a constituency of eighteen thousand persons.[8]

The same conference divided the work into twenty districts for all of Europe. These were as follows:

1. Lusatia, centering about *Herrnhut*, *Niesky* and *Kleinwelke*
2. Silesia, around *Gnadenfrei*, *Gnadenberg*, *Gnadenfeld* and *Neusalz*
3. Brandenberg, near *Berlin* and Potsdam, in Priegnitz and Altmark
4. Pomerania, in the vicinity of Stettin, Ruegen and Mecklenberg
5. In East Prussia, Koenigsberg, Dansig, Elbing, to the borders of Lithuania
6. The *Gnadau* District, i.e., Magdeburg, Halberstadt, Altmark, the Harz
7. Brunswig and Hanover
8. The *Neudietendorf* District, i.e., Thuringia
9. The *Ebersdorf* District,i.e., Voigtland, the Erzgebirge, Franconia, Upper Palatinate and the Vogelsgebirge
10. The *Neuwied* District, the Palatinate, Wetteravia, etc.
11. The Niederheim District, Berg, Cleves, etc.
12. South Germany, i.e., Wuerttemberg and Alsace
13. The Holstein District, Hamburg, Altona and vicinity
14. Denmark, Schleswig, Fuenen, Copenhagen and *Christiansfeld*
15. Norway, Christiana, Drammen and Bergen
16. Sweden, Stockholm and Gotenberg
17. Russia, Estonia and Latvia
18. Hungary, Transylvania
19. Switzerland, Montmirail, Basel, Berne, Zurich and the Grisons

8. *Ibid.*, p. 76.

20. Holland, Zeist[9]

The italics in the above list indicate Moravian congregations and reveal that where possible the Brethren made them the center of Diaspora operations.[10] An examination of these divisions also reveals that in over half of the districts there was no congregation near enough to be the center. All but the last two districts were in Lutheran territory. During the existence of the congregations in Wetteravia the Diaspora reached out to the surrounding Reformed churches, but after the evacuation of Herrnhag and Marienborn beginning in 1750 this work seems to have lapsed.

Internally the immediate post-Zinzendorfian era was one of organizational development. The very month after the Count's death the first distinctly Diaspora conference was held on June 30, 1760. This, of course, does not mark the beginning of conferences at which Diaspora affairs were dealt with, but the beginning of conferences exclusively for this purpose. Henceforth these meetings came to be not only gatherings of inspiration and fellowship, but also policy making conferences. It was the original plan that the Herrnhut conference be for the Lutheran Tropus and that a similar conference at Neuwied on the Rhine was to be for the Reformed Tropus, but the latter seems never to have developed.[11]

In this connection it may be observed that the Diaspora in general never did develop extensively in Reformed Territory. No doubt the fact that the Renewed Moravian Church came into being in a Lutheran environment is the decisive factor. However, the differences between Lutheranism and the Reformed Church must be considered. The former, more closely identified with the state, more liturgical, less concerned about strict personal behaviour, seemed to call for extra-church religious activity if the more personal needs of the individual were to be met. Pietism filled this need to a great extent. But in the case of the Reformed

---

9. Hamilton, pp. 235-236.

10. The over-all administration of the Diaspora was in the hands of the Unity's Elders' Conference, but where a congregation was near enough the local elders were in charge of the surrounding Diaspora activity.

11. Bauer, in *Zeitschrift zur Bruedergeschichte*, 1911, p. 166.

some of the features of Pietism were inherent in the church itself.

Time and experience brought forth more definitely formulated instructions and procedures in contrast to the informal travel letters given to the first generation workers by the Count himself. Holmes describes the conduct of the Diaspora as it had developed already long prior to his writing in the eighteen twenties:

> All persons, therefore, who are called to labor in this part of the Brethren's vineyard, are furnished with a copy of "Instructions" for the due discharge of their office, compiled by the Synod and sanctioned by many years' experience. The following extracts from these instructions will show the principles, on which the Brethren act in this branch of their service.
>
> 1st. "Should there exist in any place a prohibition on the part of the magistrates, preventing the execution of any particular plan, nothing must be undertaken, which might appear to be in opposition to such prohibition.
>
> 2nd. "Should any clergyman oppose the labors of the Brethren visits to his parish must, for that time, be discontinued, for an attempt to continue these visits in direct opposition to him would be highly censurable.
>
> 3rd. "When impediments are thus laid in our way, either by clergymen or magistrates, it is our duty to lay the case in prayer before our Saviour, and wait his time for removing them.
>
> 4th. "No assemblies of our Societies are to be held during the time of public service in the parish church, or late at night.
>
> 5th. "It is our duty to avoid all appearance of obtrusiveness, and what might attract useless notice; yet we must at the same time be careful to prevent every appearance of secrecy and mysteriousness."[12]

Diaspora workers learned from one another at their conferences, through circular letters, personal visits, official reports and the like. The three constitutional synods of the church (1764, 1769, 1775) placed the work under the direction of the church as a whole, with the administration in the bands of the church's executive board known as the Unity's Elders' Conference. Since the general synod was the highest authority of the church, with the executive responsible to it, Diaspora affairs were always a part of the business of synods.[13]

---

12. Holmes, II, pp. 31-32.
13. After 1857 when the church decentralized in the direction of provincial government, the Diaspora became the responsibility of the German province. Henceforth we find Diaspora affairs under German provincial synods.

The membership of the Diaspora even before Zinzendorf's death could already be divided into three classes. First there were the scattered individuals or isolated families living in localities where there was no society to which they could attach themselves. Their contacts with the Brethren would be through literature, visits of the worker, or occasional visits to Moravian centers. Such families were frequently spoken of as "Jesufamilien," or "Hauskapellen." The second classification comprised the informal, unorganized fellowship groups in communities where this was possible, but where the number was not large enough to form an organization. The third group were members in the formally organized societies, some of which were very much like full-fledged congregations. A few of the larger societies owned their meeting place. Zinzendorf discouraged the organization of members in the third category, preferring the kind of Diaspora exhibited in the first two categories. The result is that the number of organized societies remained small for a long time. It is this fact, too, which makes the gathering of Diaspora statistics so difficult. But it is also this feature of the enterprise which made it possible to flourish in the face of laws aimed against conventicles. It explains the continuing strength of the Diaspora in the Baltic provinces.

The Diaspora Conference of the year 1785 arrived at a very interesting classification of pastors in the national churches. First, there are those who neglect the Word of God. Nevertheless, there is the warning that such men should not be judged. Second, there are worldly men. Over against them the advice is not to alienate them by injudicious judgment of their way of living. Third, there are the spiritually awakened pastors, but who are not in sympathy with the Moravians. The Diaspora agents are admonished to speak of these only in terms of love and moderations. Fourth, there are there who are both spiritually awake and friendly to the Moravians. These are to be undergirded with prayer and counsel. They are not to be weaned away from their own church.[14]

---

14. Proceedings of Diaspora Conference of 1785, cited by Steinecke, I, pp. 35-36.

The intra-church influence of the Brethren was probably as great during the late eighteenth century as at any time in their history. A lifetime had elapsed since the beginning of Herrnhut. Moravian settlements had gained the respect of all of Europe as islands of spiritual vitality in an era of arid religious life in the state church. Even the secular minded appreciated the Moravians as substantial citizens contributing to the well-being of the nation. Their elementary and secondary schools, by this time numbering over twenty in Europe and America, had achieved a substantial reputation for character building, and were patronized by distinguished families on both sides of the Atlantic. The world-wide outreach of the foreign mission enterprise was beginning to have a fructifying effect upon the outlook of other Protestant churches.

In 1778 Spangenberg committed to writing the Brethren's theology in his classic *Idea Fidei Fratrum*. It was in agreement with the Augsburg Confession and, in accord with the Moravian position, did not purport to be a new and distinct theology. It was more scriptural than theological in language, and represented well the heart religion of the Brethren. Its wide sale is evidence of their influence. It was extensively read not only in Germany, but was translated into English, Danish, French, Swedish, Dutch, Bohemian and Polish.[15] In the same year Christian Gregor prepared a new Moravian hymnal. Many of its hymns found their way into other churches. Moravian mission literature, too, found a wide audience.[16] Cranz's *History of Greenland* appeared in 1765, Oldendorp's *History of the Mission in the Danish West Indies* in 1777, and Loskiel's *History of the Mission Among the North American Indians* in 1789.

The theological seminary of the Brethren at Barby enjoyed friendly visits from professors at both Halle and Wittenberg. Active correspondence[17] was maintained with Leipsig, Wittenberg, Halle, Jena, Tuebingen, Giesen, Goettingen, Erlangen, and

15. Hutton, p. 414.
16. It was in these years that William Carey was an enthusiastic reader of Moravian mission reports, an important factor in his becoming the great pioneer of Protestant foreign missions.
17. The minutes of the Herrnhut Ministers' Conference contain much of this correspondence and are a good index of the high status of the Brethren.

Helmstaedt. Hamilton says "the former tone of controversy had given place to one of esteem and approval on the part of conservative theologians."[18]

In all of this the Diaspora was both cause and effect.

---

18. *History*, p. 233.

CHAPTER IV
The Nineteenth Century

The high point of the late eighteenth century was followed by about a generation of standstill and even retrogression, a period coinciding with the disturbances of the Napoleonic era. At least half of the Moravian settlement congregations were either in the line of fighting or occupied at one time or other by the military forces. One settlement, Barby, was permanently abandoned. We could hardly expect otherwise than a set-back during such an era.

Yet the Napoleonic wars do not account entirely for the state of Moravian affairs. There was also a decline of vitality in the church itself as it shared the general spiritual depression of the age. In order to combat it the church's leaders clung blindly to external forms and regulations inherited from former days.[1] This was particularly reflected in the general synod of 1801 which laid down policies to be in effect until the next synod in 1818. It was obvious from various expressions of discontent that the church ought to have adjusted some of its rules to changing external conditions. The choir system, particularly as it related to the single brethren, needed overhauling. There was dissatisfaction over the widespread use of the lot and a desire on the part of progressive elements to restrict its use. The laity was beginning to ask for a larger voice in the direction of affairs. The adherents of the status quo, however, were in the majority and voted to observe the old order more strictly than ever, rather than adjust to the new.

In a vain effort to counteract the secularizing influences in the church the Brethren officially recognized the spirituality of a faithful nucleus. This they set up as the actual kernel of the congregation, entrusting to it certain responsibilities of leadership. The idea was supposed to go back to a similar one of Zinzendorf's in 1731. Actually it was a narrowing down of the Count's idea of a "Congregation of God in the Spirit" to a fragment within the Unity.[2] The results of such an artificial division

1. Hamilton, p. 298.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 299.

were further spiritually depressing. Unfortunately the synod of 1818, though more progressive than that of 1801, continued the two-fold division and not until 1825 was the impossibility of such a system acknowledged by its abrogation.

The Diaspora could not but share this ebb tide. The best can be said is that an earnest effort was made to maintain the circuits that had been formed hitherto. Whereas in a previous generation the Moravians would have welcomed and participated in religious awakenings such as occurred in Switzerland and parts of South Germany at this time, they now tended to remain aloof in their more or less restricted circles. An exception is that as a consequence of awakenings in the Netze and Warthe river regions east of Berlin, in the seventeen nineties, Diaspora work was extended there in 1802. Ever since this territory has been one of the bright spots of the Moravian fellowship. Also counter to the general temper of the work in these early years of the nineteenth century was the impetus given to the Diaspora in the Russian Baltic provinces by an imperial edict granting extended freedom and privileges to the Brethren.[3]

About 1820 there came an upsurge in the kind of religious life represented by the Moravians. Germany experienced something of a religious revival as a reaction against rationalism. Schleiermacher himself deeply influenced by early Moravian schooling is one of the conspicuous symbols of the change. The emphasis upon experiental religion at Diaspora meetings again began to have greater appeal. The majority of state pastors, not much effected in the early years of this revival, were not able to satisfy the needs of those of the laity who were so moved. In North Germany in particular there was little provision for the awakened apart from the Moravian societies. Consequently the Diaspora membership regained and perhaps surpassed the numerical strength which it had attained at the close of the previous century.[4]

During this period, says Steinecke, the emphasis was somewhat different from earlier days. Previously the stress had been upon winning souls for the Kingdom of Heaven. The conception of a

3. Cf. Chap. VI.
4. Steinecke, I, p. 77.

purely spiritual fellowship had dominated. Now the emphasis was upon church problems and the relationship of the life of the Christian to that of the church. Also during this period the Diaspora experienced somewhat more opposition from state church pastors who frequently induced civil authorities to employ restrictive measures against conventicles. The success or failure of a particular society often hinged upon the attitude of the parish minister.

Restrictions varied from place to place and from time to time, but were more or less of the same type. Free speaking was generally looked upon with suspicion and often limited to ordained men. The number of persons allowed to meet might be limited to a small number. (In 1834 in Prussia a regulation set the number at twenty). The Brethren might be required to give an annual list of their adherents to the local consistory. Again the regulations might prescribe that a religious meeting be limited to the use of the Bible, the hymn book, or other literature on the approved list. Those in charge of meetings were often specifically instructed not to allow the presence of persons of known separatist tendencies. Occasionally Diaspora workers experienced imprisonment or fines for infractions of the law. These restrictions throughout Germany reflected the attempt to repress the growing unrest which was to lead up to the political upheaval of 1848. In Prussia the situation was accentuated by the tension following in the wake of the formation of the Union Church in 1817.[5]

Had extra church life in Germany been limited to the Moravian Diaspora the Brethren probably would have had a freer hand. By this time they had over a century of evidence on their side that they were not disturbers of the peace, but on the contrary real friends of the established church. Men in both high and low places had come under their influence and knew their record. But also by this time, beginning about the time of the Congress of Vienna in 1815, the free church movement in Europe began to take shape. In the attempt of the authorities to control the rising separatism, Moravians, though they were conformists, felt the heavy hand of the law really intended for others more

5. *Itid.*, p. 78.

dangerous to the unity of the state than they were.

On the whole the Diaspora flourished during the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Long experienced at adjusting themselves to political circumstances and little given to the demonstrative type of piety, the Moravians managed to continue along their quiet ways.

In 1830 the Diaspora extended its outreach into Russian Poland where German immigrants from Wuerttemberg and the Palatinate had settled early in the century. A few of these immigrants had been Diaspora adherents in their homeland and eagerly welcomed a supplement to the meager pastoral care afforded to them in Poland by the few Lutheran and Reformed clergymen. Like the Netze and Warthe districts in Prussia this work developed into a thriving field, lasting until the tragic events of World War II made displaced persons out of these German Poles.

The conduct of the typical Diaspora meeting varied little from generation to generation. We might pick our illustrations from any period. The well known Englishman, George Mueller, philanthropist and patron of orphans, furnishes us with one from his student days in Halle which fell in this era:

> One Saturday afternoon, about the middle of November, 1825, I had taken a walk with my friend Beta. On our return he said to me, that he was in the habit of going on Saturday evening to the house of a Christian, where there was a meeting. On further inquiry he told me that they read the Scriptures, sang, prayed and read a printed sermon. No sooner had I heard this, but it was to me as if I had found something after which I had been seeking all my life long. I immediately wished to go with my friend, who was not at once willing to take me; for knowing me as a gay young man, he thought I should not like the meeting. At last, however, he said he would call for me.
>
> We went together in the evening, and not knowing the manners of the brethren, and the joy they have in seeing poor sinners, even in any measure, caring about the things of God, I made an apology for coming. He said, come as often as you please; house and heart are open to you. We sat down and sang an hymn. Then brother Kayser, now a missionary in Africa, in connection with the London Missionary Society, who was then living at Halle, fell on his knees and asked a blessing on our meeting. This kneeling made a deep impression upon me, for I had never either seen any one on his knees, nor had I ever myself prayed on my knees. He then read a chapter, and a printed sermon; for no regular meeting for expounding the Scriptures was al-

lowed in Prussia, except an ordained clergyman was present. At the close we sang another hymn, and then my feeling was something like this; I could not pray as well, though I am much more learned than this illiterate man. The whole made a deep impression on me. I was happy; though if I had been asked why I was happy, I could not have clearly explained it.

When we walked home, I said to Beta, all we have seen on our journey to Switzerland, and all our former pleasures are as nothing in comparison with this evening. Whether I fell on my knees when I returned home I do not remember; but I know that I lay peaceful and happy in my bed. This shows that the Lord may begin his work in different ways. For I have not the least doubt, that on that evening the Lord began a work of grace in me, though I got joy without any deep sorrow of heart, and with scarcely any knowledge. But that evening was the turning point in my life. The next day, and Monday, and once or twice besides, I went again to the house of this brother, where I read the Scriptures with him and another brother; for it was too long for me to wait till Saturday came again.[6]

In a number of ways the situation as described by Mueller is typical of the Diaspora. It was a small meeting in a home with no clergyman present. It was almost anonymous, for the friend who introduced him to it, according to the account, spoke simply of his custom of visiting the home of a "Christian." In accord with the Zinzendorfian ideal, the connection with the Moravians was only in the background. There was a read sermon, for preaching was rarely a part of a Diaspora meeting. The emphasis was upon experiental religion of a quiet devotional type. Though the meeting was scheduled for Saturday, it was quite acceptable for Mueller to break into the schedule in the days preceding. Finally, the later mission career of the leader, Brother Kayser, is representative of the strong mission interest pervading the Diaspora enterprise. The likelihood is that this house group was visited by the worker in charge of the district once or twice a year.

In place of the preached sermon were substituted sermons of Zinzendorf or other Moravian leaders, Luther, Francke, etc. Bogatsky's devotional *Schatzkaestlein* was commonly used, as was Arndt's *True Christianity*.[7] The church sermon of the morn-

6. George Mueller, *A Narrative of Some of the Lord's Dealings with George Mueller*, pp. 11-12.

7. Steinecke, I, p.

ing, if the meeting came on a Sunday, was frequently reviewed. An important phase of the content of Diaspora programs were reports and letters from the Moravian mission fields which within a few decades after their beginning in 1732 had a wide geographic range.

As we have already noted, early Diaspora agents were predominantly laymen. In principle this continued to be true even a century after Zinzendorf and continues to the present day. Nevertheless, as time passed there was a larger proportion of clergymen because of the closer relationship of the Diaspora to other branches of the church's work. Missionaries, usually ordained men, (though until modern times often theologically untrained) unable longer to withstand the rigors of the foreign field, might be placed in Diaspora service. Or conversely, the Diaspora has been the place where many a future missionary had his first experience in practical Christian service. The fact that the Diaspora agent was a layman has helped the Moravians in many situations to maintain a Diaspora status in the face of separatist tendencies, for it kept from the agent the temptation to perform the sacramental functions of the church. For the same reason the services of a lay Diaspora worker would be received with less suspicion on the part of state pastors.[8]

Regardless of whether or not the Diaspora representative was ordained, he was no longer obliged to earn his own living with outside work already soon after the time of Zinzendorf. The men in charge of the districts became full-time paid servants of the church. This made the Diaspora a growing item of expense. It was expected that the respective districts support their own workers, but many were unable to do so. As a means of raising money throughout the church the General Synod of 1801[9] voted a subsidy for the work, and the General Synod of 1818[10] set aside

8. Dr. Heinz Renkewitz, president of the governing board of the Moravian Church of Germany, American Zone, in a conversation with the author in September of 1950 in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, gave this as one of the reasons why about half of Diaspora workers are still laymen, though in full-time religious service of the church. Dr. Renkewitz was in the United States following his attendance upon an executive meeting of the World Council of Churches in Toronto, Canada, in July, 1950.

9. "Minutes of the Synod of 1801," MS in Moravian Archives.

10. "Minutes of the Synod of 1818," MS in Moravian Archives.

the day after Whitsunday as an annual observance of Diaspora day in the German Moravian congregations. Because the Diaspora became increasingly a means of bringing Moravian Missions to the attention of the devout it was long regarded as a part of the expense of missions.

In all of Germany during the second quarter of the century Diaspora membership approached the forty thousand mark and was divided into fifteen to twenty districts.[11] In German Switzerland the membership was upwards of twenty-five hundred, with main centers at Basel, Bern and Zurich. From Montmirail and Moutier in French Switzerland perhaps two or three hundred were in connection with the Brethren. In France a society in Strasburg ministered to a hundred or more persons and in the South, in the vicinity of St. Hippolite, there was a more or less tenuous effort. In Denmark, Norway and Sweden there were nine centers with a total membership of about twenty-six hundred. The new work in Russian Poland beginning in 1830 was gaining momentum, but does not figure as an important field until the second half of the century. Greater numerically than all of the above combined was the Diaspora in Baltic Russia. Figures for 1822 for this field report over forty thousand, making the total membership about eighty thousand[11]. The general trend of membership was upwards until about the middle of the century. Estimates of Diaspora strength as its numerical peak range from the lower figure to over one hundred thousand.[13]

The mid-century saw the beginning of a new era for the Diaspora, one in which the work called for readjustments which could not easily be made. The over-all picture of the Diaspora during the latter half of the nineteenth century gives one the impression of an enterprise that had reached maturity and which was exhibiting some of the disadvantages of age. During this time the Moravians had to rely pretty heavily on the momentum of the past to keep up their societies.

11. The districts, with minor shifts here and there, were approximately the same as given on pages 39-40.

12. For a complete summary of Moravian statistics for the year 1822 see Holmes, II, pp. 353-362.

13. *Moravian Miscellany*, 1850, p. 6.

Specifically, the chief factor confronting the Diaspora was the establishment of free churches in Europe, beginning in force after the Revolution of 1848. Many of the "awakened" who formerly would have given expression to their religion through participation in extra-church societies went the whole way and joined a free church. It is interesting to note that much of the impetus came from America. Europe was sending its millions of emigrants to America. Foreign language churches were instrumental in holding many of these to their hereditary faith. At the same time some of these immigrants, touched by the energy of American Protestantism, returned to Europe as evangelists to influence greatly the church life of the home land.

Latourette views the picture as follows:

> The phenomenal energy which characterized Protestantism in the nineteenth century was displayed in part in efforts to bring into that form of Christianity members of the Roman Catholic and Eastern communions and to reach adherents from other branches of Protestantism. Seldom, if ever, were these activities undertaken primarily with the purpose of aggrandizing a denomination. They arose from a genuine conviction that the other forms of Christianity were false or inadequate or that those whom the missions were designed to reach had at best only a nominal Christian connection and were spiritually destitute. Much of Protestant missions among traditionally Christian peoples deliberately eschewed any effort to alter denominational or confessional affiliations, but endeavored rather to inject new life into existing Christian bodies.
>
> Methodists and Baptists from Great Britain and especially from the United States built up churches on the Continent. Much of this effort was begun by sailors or emigrants from the Continent who had come into a vigorous religious experience by contact with these denominations in America had returned to spread their new faith in their home countries. The Disciples of Christ, Christian Science, Mormans and Seventh Day Adventists were groups of America origins which won footholds in Europe.[14]

From the above we note that the free churches approached the adherents of the European churches with much the same purpose as the Moravian Diaspora. It was not primarily with a denominational aim, but with a mind to quicken a religious life which the evangelists deemed merely nominal. Like the Moravian Breth-

14. Kenneth Scott Latourette, *History of the Expansion of Christianity*, IV, p. 130.

ren, they regarded the ministrations of the state churches inadequate for the nurture of spiritual life, hence the need for extra-church religious activity. But unlike the Moravian Brethren, they followed up their work with the organization of denominational churches. Unfettered by a tradition of loyalty to an established church, the free church evangelists found it easy to do this. Thus consolidating the fruits of their revivals, they soon left the Brethren far behind, numerically speaking.

American Methodism was taken to Germany in 1849. In 1896 the movement combined with the British Methodists who had come to Germany a few years before the Americans, and in 1913 the membership had grown to 28,000. The United Brethren went to Germany in 1881 and before uniting with the Methodists in 1905 had attained a membership of about 1000. American Baptists began a mission in Germany in 1834 and by 1913 had over 200 churches and 43,000 members. From 1874 to 1912 the Seventh Day Adventists grew to a membership of 6800 in Germany and to 1000 in Switzerland. Significant gains were also made in Germany by the Evangelical Alliance Church, founded by Jacob Albright in Pennsylvania.

The same gains for free churches can be recorded for the Scandinavian countries. English Methodism was introduced into Sweden in 1830 and American Methodism in 1853. Legal recognition was granted in 1876 and in 1913 the membership was 17,637. By 1913 the Baptists in Sweden numbered 53,087. The Seventh Day Adventists in Sweden in 1913 reported 3,305 members. Between 1850-1909 the Mormons are said to have gained over 17,000 converts in Sweden.

A Methodist movement arose in Norway in 1850 and by 1893 had won 4500 members. Ironically it was a man who owed his impulse to the Moravians, namely, Gustave Adolf Lammers,[15] who began the Baptist movement in Norway about the middle of the nineteenth century. By 1902 Baptists numbered 2,766 in that country.

---

15. *Ibid.*, p. 136.

In the same manner and about the same time Baptists, Methodists, Church of the Brethren (Dunkers) and others entered Denmark, winning proportionate followings.[16]

Protestant churches also made gains in Russia during this period under review. German Baptists entered the Empire in 1840. At first confining their efforts to their countrymen, they made converts largely from Lutherans. Especially was this true of the Baltic provinces. In Poland they soon had success among Roman Catholics and Uniates. At the same time Protestant organizations like the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Evangelical Alliance, the Berlin Bible School, Plymouth Brethren, the Sunday School Union, the Young Men's Christian Association, the World's Student Christian Federation, the Deutsche Orient Mission, and others extended their activities to Russia.

Other lands were entered upon, but the foregoing are those in which the Moravian work was impinged upon. It is clear from a reading of Diaspora reports that the people drawn into these free churches were the ones who hitherto would likely have been Diaspora members.

In addition to the competition from the well recognized Protestant churches referred to above the Diaspora agents had to face that of free lance workers and representatives of obscurantist sects. One community in Wuerttemberg, for instance, was upset for quite some time by the propaganda of the Amana colony in the state of Iowa.[17] Moravian workers had to exercise much patience and restraint in answering the questions of disturbed minds.

Parallel also to the religious stirrings which produced free churches was a growing spirit of secularism. The ferment of Marxism was at work. Growing industrialism was making labor self-conscious of its position. With the European churches taking a hands-off policy on labor questions, they failed to hold the loyalty of the trade unions. Added to this were the unsettling effects of the "higher criticism" of the theologians in the universities. The latter half of the nineteenth century on the whole was a trying time for the Diaspora staff. Reports of ridicule and in-

16. This statistical summary is taken from Latourette, IV, pp. 133-142.
17. *Moravian Messenger*, 1881, pp. 311-312.

difference repeatedly appear in the reports the agents sent back to their boards. Yet they persevered and retained the spirit of the Diaspora tradition.

The effect of these various forces is mirrored in the Diaspora reports of the time, as we gather from random excerpts:

> The Diaspora work of the Brethren's Church is not of recent origin, but has existed for over a hundred years. It has nothing in common with the sectarian forces which more and more in Germany today would have us believe, each with his peculiar doctrines, that it is alone the custodian of God's secrets. They do not gather, but scatter, in that they take into membership those who are awakened out of their dream of their lives asleep in sin, but who are not yet sure of their salvation, and then tell them that there is no salvation, or at least it is very difficult, outside of their group. While the Brethren's Church remains aloof from such a conception, so she remains aloof also from such an effort to gain members.
>
> We acknowledge as a work of God every church fellowship that holds to the true preaching of the Gospel and extends the God-given means of grace according to the Scriptures, and wish only to do what has been entrusted to us, to serve in her midst as "the older sister and servant of the Evangelical Church," and this is the purpose of our Diaspora activity.[18]

In a similar vein reads a report of the year 1878:

> In spite of the not insignificant roster of workers which we employ in the various Diaspora districts, our strength is weak. It is weak because the field which we work is so large. As a consequence our agents can only infrequently visit the souls who are in connection with us, at most twice a year, here and there only once a year, while the representatives of other bodies repeat their visits much oftener and frequently unite them in the administration of the Lord's Supper.
>
> When one considers how the situation has changed in comparison with former times, when we were almost alone in this work, so one could easily get oneself to believe that our work is not so necessary, at least not as desired as formerly.[19]

However, the report goes on to try to convince the reader that the door is still open. It presents the difficulties as a challenge rather than as a reason for quitting the field:

> On the one hand one gets the impression that the work is much more difficult than formerly; it is made more difficult through the activities

18. *Die Arbeit der Brueder-Gemeine in der Diaspora*, 1860, p. 3.
19. *Kurze Mittheilungen aus dem Diasporawerk der Bruedergemeine auf dem Europaischen Festlande*, 1878, p. 3.

> of many sects, who by means of gifted orators draw the people to themselves and their peculiar views. Further the spirit of the times stands in the way of our agents, so that where they once encountered pious behaviour and customs, they now encounter carelessness and materialism. In the wake of a lack of breeding on the part of the rising generation dissatisfaction and broken family life often arise, where formerly heartfelt unity and love bound all members together. But if such and other circumstances make the work more difficult, so is it the more necessary. How often our Brethren are welcomed as counselling and praying friends and greeted with a "God-be-praised that you came, we have waited anxiously for your visit."[20]

A report from the year 1880 points to the unsettling effects of obscurantists and how the Diaspora tries to counteract them:

> From different parts of the field our agents report with sorrow that ever and anon apostles of some new sect present themselves; they have grasped a few Scriptural truths, but in the main their doctrinal teaching is false; they mix a great amount of what is human with a small proportion of what is Biblical. Thus the minds of the people are confused; many have made shipwrecks of their former childlike faith in the simple doctrine of the Gospel. . . .Many associate themselves with these sects from the mistaken view that the cause of their not having found peace hitherto was to be found in the doctrine they had been taught. In such cases our Diaspora agents, acting in strict accordance with their aim to win souls for Jesus, and then to bring them into fellowship with one another, have not grown weary in declaring that *it is not secession from the church* in order to unite with some new sect, nor yet the adoption of any peculiar form of creed, that makes the sinner just before God and brings him happiness, but alone living faith in the Saviour.[21]

The remarkable thing is that the Moravians so largely resisted the temptation to proselytize. Of course, occasionally there appears an undertone of questioning. A Diaspora account of the year 1870 asks what purpose does the Church of the Brethren fulfil.[22] It goes on to comment on the low state of the national churches, and even foresees the end of the Establishment. The prediction is that the Diaspora would turn into a free church.

The same frame of mind is expressed in a letter from an agent from Norway. He reports the loss of many Diaspora members to

---

20. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
21. *Moravian Messenger*, 17, 1880, p. 250.
22. *Moravian Messenger*, 7, 1870, p. 134.

other societies and mentions the proximity of the Methodist and Baptist churches. His conclusion is that "if a Brethren's congregation had been settled here fifteen years ago many of these would certainly be in connection with us still."[23]

But on the whole such sentiments remain in the realm of thinking aloud and the German Moravians continued to work in Diaspora patterns. The example of Zinzendorf and various other forefathers, the highly centralized control of the church, the heavy over-seas mission commitments, the conditioning to conservative ways stood in the way of an aggressive home mission advance. There were dissenting voices, but not loud enough to disturb Moravians very seriously in their role as "die Stillen im Lande."[24]

However, it cannot be denied that the Moravian Church on the Continent was affected by the trend toward denominationalism in the second half of the nineteenth century. We note this from several aspects. For one thing they actually organized a number of congregations, not on the settlement plan, but as regular town or country congregations common to other denominations. In Germany a congregation was organized at Breslau in 1880 and at Hausdorf in 1873. Also in 1873 four Diaspora societies in Switzerland became congregations, namely, at Montmirail, Peseux, Locle, and Chauxde-Fonds. In 1869 the General Synod resolved to intensify a work of evangelization in Bohemia and Moravia, "not on the basis of the Diaspora, but with the reestablishment of the Unity as a distinct church."[25] A decade earlier, at the Synod of 1859, the church had begun work in these lands on the Diaspora basis. A factor in this change to a denominational program was that the American and British Moravians were to assist in the project, making it not just a missionary effort of the German Moravians, but of the Unity as a whole. In the eighteen seventies Germans from Poland, acquainted with the Diaspora there, had migrated to the Russian province of Volhynia. Wishing to keep contact with these settlers, the Moravians organized two congregations there in 1884, though the enterprise was of

23. *Moravian Messenger*, 18, 1881, p. 192.
24. A common designation of the Brethren thoughout Germany.

25. Hamilton, p. 473.

short duration because of political difficulties.[26] Two other projects, also short-lived, were congregations organized among Germans in southern Australia in 1857, and in Brazil in 1886. The congregation in Brazil was really a follow-up of the unsuccessful attempt in Volhynia in 1884, some of the families having emigrated to the South American country. Both the Brazilian and Australian efforts were soon absorbed by the Lutherans.

In Germany itself we observe further that with the influx of people into the cities many Moravians who had been members of settlement congregations like Herrnhut, Niesky, Ebersdorf, Kleinwelke, etc., found themselves in the larger population centers as non-resident members of their home churches. The natural thing for them to do was to attach themselves to the Diaspora societies which existed in the cities. The result was to influence these societies to assume more and more the character of congregations. Thus Burkhardt describes them:

> The societies are here more compact; the members are received into the society with a formal ceremony and the services are held more often and more regularly. Yes, the Lord's Supper is even celebrated in this little group according to the customs of the Brethren, naturally with the consent of the church authority concerned. A Moravian minister himself has his residence there. Such societies exist in Koenigsberg, Danzig, Stettin, Potsdam, Bremen, Strassburg. But also outside of Germany there are such in various cities.[27]

The Inner Mission movement, founded by J. H. Wichern in 1851, had close ties with the Diaspora. Wichern himself, nurtured in Pietist circles, crossed paths frequently with those in connection with the Brethren. "When one follows Wichern's path through Germany one can observe that this herald of the Inner Mission more than once found a sympathetic response where the Brethren had been active."[28] Of course the Brethren had long combined works of charity with their evangelism, beginning with schools for the poor in their settlements in the days of Zinzendorf. The activities of the Bible societies, distribution of tracts, per-

26. In the eighteen nineties some of these German Russians emigrated to Alberta, Canada. It was among these people that the Moravians began their work in Western Canada in 1895.

27. Burkhardt, II, p. 68.

28. Steinecke, I, p. 96.

sonal evangelization, organization of young people's societies, efforts to bring about better observance of the Sabbath, temperance education—all part of the program of Inner Missions – were activities which came quite natural to the Diaspora. More and more we find the Moravian program assuming the character of Inner Mission work. Not actually part of the Diaspora but closely related in its outreach was the establishment of an order of Moravian deaconesses in 1866 at Gnadenfeld. In 1883 the headquarters were transferred to Niesky where the training center and hospital have continued up to the present time. (Theodore Flieder had begun the deaconess movement in 1833 and within the next half century in Germany Protestant churches were employing eight thousand deaconesses in hospitals, poor-houses, orphanages, and schools and as parish helpers).

Reporting activities from Europe, the *Moravian Miscellany* carries a report of the Brethren's interest in the Inner Mission in the very year of its beginning:

> The most important feature, however, of this year (1849) is the further extension of the Home Mission movement in our trans-Atlantic congregations, or of the work of Inner Mission, as it is the term in Germany. . . .
>
> Beginning with Herrnhut, our parent congregation, we find that in the Ministerial Conference, consisting of ministers of the Lutheran, the Reformed and Brethren's Churches convened there on June the 6th, br. Curic presiding, a great deal of its limited time was devoted to the discussion of the Inner Mission.

The same report continues with an account of what two Brethren actually did:

> From Neudietendorf, for instance, two brothers were sent out as colporteurs, by whom in the course of the year, 2800 copies of Bibles and New Testaments were distributed among the poor and destitute. In a similar manner the activity of the Bible Society at Niesky was increased by the commission of a Bible Colporteur for the immediate neighborhood. A like resolution was passed at an anniversary of the Bible Society at Ebersdorf, August 26; whilst at the same time several members of that congregation united by the distribution of tracts to traveling journeymen and other strangers, to help as much as possible to increase the desire for the word of life.
>
> Several missionary anniversaries at Neuwied, Koenigsfeld, and Zeist served to renew the zeal for the propagation of the Gospel among the heathen, whilst at the same time the work of the Inner Mission was

> not only urgently recommended, but also cheerfully supported, in some places by the regular distribution of tracts, in others by forming Sunday Schools for apprentices or by establishing infant-schools for the poor at neighboring villages, or by establishing circulating libraries of religious workers, open to all. Such an infant school for the poor had been opened at Zeist in the previous year by some single sisters, and already numbered more than 100 children, who by their diligence richly repaid the labor bestowed upon them. In Niesky the poor children and infants from the neighborhood not only receive regular daily instruction, but also a plain substantial dinner, whereby their parents are enabled to attend more cheerfully to their daily labor, knowing that their little ones are well cared for during the whole day.[29]

In 1850 the congregation of Herrnhut formed an association for "Christian Aid" for helping the poor in surrounding villages. The same association also distributed alms to journeymen-mechanics. A colporteur employed by the association during the year 1851 who had visited over twenty villages "sold upward of 80 books and 1400 tracts, given away more than 150 tracts, and loaned out more than 160 books."[30]

A spinning school at Berthelsdorf employed poor children who earned a small amount while they were learning a trade. Religious instruction was part of the program also. From Gnadenfeld reports for the same year concern a *Sunday Association of Married Men* who spend the hours from three to five in the afternoon in social intercourse and in reading of tracts. The impetus for this association had been the conversion of a drunkard.[31]

Reports from Diaspora circles a generation later reveal that the Inner Mission type of service was continuing unabated:

> Here is a man who has lost his earthly possession; there another in a mood of depression entertains thoughts of suicide. To these our messengers appear as God-sent angels to comfort them, uplift them and perhaps rescue them from destruction. Our Brethren have access to societies of all kinds, in rescue homes, hospitals and deaconesses homes, and nurseries, and to old and young can testify according to the manner of Brethren and bring souls to the Saviour. Especially the chronically ill of all ages and ranks, who are often in a lonely situation rejoice at the visits of our workers who encourage and strengthen them. Yes, unnumbered and known to the Lord alone are the open

29. *Moravian Miscellany*, II, pp. 215-216.
30. *Moravian Miscellany*, IV, p. 172.
31. *Ibid.*, pp. 173-174.

doors which our Brethren encountered in the past year.[32]

This identification of the Diaspora with Inner Mission work certainly was an important factor in imparting new life to the Brethren's activity. As we gather from the reports, Diaspora agents were beginning to question the reason for the continuance of their work. The growing program of social service helped to answer their doubts, and helped to keep alive many a local society that might otherwise have passed out of existence. Just as important, perhaps even more so, to the welfare of the Diaspora was the high level of missionary interest during the nineteenth century. First felt in England and America, the missionary awakening soon spread to the Continent, giving rise to the formation of numerous mission societies, beginning with the Basel Society in 1815. The majority of these societies, came into existence before the middle of the century, but their strength continued right on up to the first World War. The pioneer status of the Herrnhuters with reference to the foreign mission enterprise made them a focus of interest when this missionary awakening came to Protestantism in general. Outside of Moravian circles it increased interest in things Moravian. The mission literature of the Brethren had a wide circle of readers. Their missionaries were held up as examples to inspire zeal for missions in others. The upsurge which came to the Diaspora in the second quarter of the century was in part the result of the missionary awakening. Continuing mission interest was a factor in counteracting the decline which the Diaspora began to experience after the mid-century. In the face of competing religious forces many clung to the Moravians because of their missionary program, and some Diaspora groups became in reality not so much Diaspora societies as societies in aid of Moravian missions.[33]

Statistics are of decreasing value in trying to measure the extent of the Diaspora during the late nineteenth century. The membership of the more or less organized societies could be compiled fairly accurately. This was the pattern of the older Diaspora

---

32. *Kurze Mittheilungen aus dem Diasporawerk der Bruedergemeine*, 1878, p.

33. This development was even more the case in the twentieth century, and will be commented on in the treatment of that period.

work. As noted, in metropolitan centers this continued and became even more clearly defined. Likewise in Eastern Germany and Russian Poland the original "Gemeinschaftspflege" (nurturing of fellowship) continued to be the point of emphasis. But where the emphasis was upon Inner Mission work, especially in the realm of personal work such as the Brethren engaged in, it was very difficult to compile figures. Then, too, in some places Diaspora workers assumed the role simply of itinerant evangelists, being guest preachers where there were friendly state pastors, or in the free churches which by now had become numerous. In those communities where Diaspora activity was primarily in aid of Moravian missions there was no organized membership. Finally, in Baltic Russia, the anti-German feeling coupled with a complicated political situation served to keep the Diaspora in the status of an undercover movement.

From 1870 to 1878 the estimates are 100,000 for the total Diaspora enterprise. In 1879 the estimate was dropped to 70,000, an acknowledgement of the decline of the work in the Baltic states. This remained the estimate at the turn of the century. The number of Diaspora agents fluctuated from a high of about sixty to a low of about forty-five with an average of fifty-five.

The various forces at work in Europe as pointed out in the foregoing pages made the Diaspora program increasingly diverse. Besides the original type of Diaspora meetings supervised by the agents the work embraced other "aims for the Kingdom of God, especially evangelization and Inner Missions; also the Diaspora has the commission to spread knowledge of our foreign missions."[34]

Yes, it had become clear to the German Moravian Church that its Diaspora was no longer a simple gathering of awakened souls, but an arm of the church called upon to minister to diverse needs in an increasingly complex world. This was to become even more apparent during the first half of the present century.

---

34. *Brueder Kalender*, Statistisches Jahrbuch der evangelischen Bruederkirche und ihrer Werke, 1900, p. 46.

CHAPTER V

The Twentieth Century

Though it was not immediately apparent, the turn of the century brought with it a new era for the Diaspora, characterized by a more realistic appraisal of the work on the part of the Moravian Church's administrative leadership. The latter half of the nineteenth century had indeed been a time of testing, during which, had it not been for the stimulus of both inner and foreign missions, the enterprise would have dwindled even much more seriously than it did. But having more or less marked time for so long, the Brethren somehow recovered themselves.

To be sure the casual observer would not have noticed any change. The difference was one of morale rather than one of outward growth. The work in the Baltic states was being repressed almost to the state of extinction, but the Brethren had been writing that off the books for a long time, and recognizing the impossibility of combatting conditions there, they ceased to let it continue to discourage them.

The fifty circuits reported in the previous chapter represented a strategic geographic spread, being located in practically all of the German provinces, and outside of Germany, in Switzerland, France, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Estonia, Latvia and Poland.[1] In more detail we note the locations in Germany to be as follows: Kingdom of Saxony; Kingdom of Prussia—Silesia, Brandenburg, Pomerania, East and West Prussia, Saxony, Rhineland, and Schleswig-Holstein; North Germany—Brungswig, Hanover, Lippe, Bremen and Hamburg; Middle Germany—Thuringia, Hesse and Saxony; South Germany—Wuerttemberg. Twenty-nine of the fifty stations were in Germany itself. In about half of the circuits the center from which the work radiated was a Moravian congregation. In the others the congregations were too distantly located for this to be the case, and the administration was in charge of the church as a whole.

In Switzerland the Diaspora centers were in the city and canton of Basel, in the city and canton of Zurich, in the canton of

1. Addresebuch der Brueder-Unitaet, January, 1901, p. 14-16.

Aargau, and in the city of Bern. The Diaspora in French speaking territory, as previously noted, had organized itself into the congregations of Montmirail, Peseux, Locle and Chaux-de-Fond in 1873,[2] though the influence of the Moravians continued to radiate from these centers in Diaspora fashion, particularly expressing itself in mission interest.

The work in France, never having had more than one or two agents, was confined to one locality, that of Montbeliard in the South, near Bordeaux. At no time during this century has it even had one full-time agent, being kept in contact, however, with the Moravian Church through the French speaking Moravians in Switzerland.

The three Scandinavian countries[3] had two Diaspora workers each, though in Norway and Sweden the number of persons reached was but a few hundred.

In the Baltic states the full-time workers had been reduced to five.

For its three circuits in Poland, the Diaspora had four agents. It proved to be one of the most encouraging fields of all, having six circuits and a greatly increased membership when the tragedy of World War II overtook it.

Though not listed as part of the Diaspora the work of the Moravians in Holland centering in the two small congregations of Zeist and Haarlem had a wide circle of friends actively supporting the mission work in Surinam.

In view of this geographic spread it is difficult to look at the work as a whole and appraise its progress or decline. Gains would be offset by losses there. Or again the different territories

---

2. Philip Genser, Foreign exchange student from Basel, studying banking at New York University during 1950-51, and an active member of the Moravian society in Basel, expressed the viewpoint to the author that Moravians in French Switzerland had lessened their influence by denominationalizing. Having separated themselves from the state church, the French Moravians had in the eyes of many become a sect. During Genser's stay in America he associated himself with the First Moravian Church of New York City, though at home he is a member of the Reformed Church.

3. At this date the flourishing congregation, Christiansfeld, Denmark, the center of an extensive Diaspora work, must still be listed among the German circuits. Counting this, in what is now Denmark there were four Diaspora agents.

by the time of the early twentieth century had begun to reflect strongly different emphases. In one community the Diaspora would continue along its traditional lines, in another the worker would be primarily a travelling evangelist preaching as the invited guest of the local pastor, in another place he would be regarded as the equivalent of the American rescue mission worker.

In a general sort of way it can be observed that during the course of the past one hundred years the Diaspora's strength had travelled toward the East. Bauer in the year 1911 makes this observation:

> It is not possible to speak of continuing progress or retrogression during the past one hundred years. . . .As a whole the work is in a healthy condition. It lies in the nature of a free and inward affair, that it dies off here and there, but sprouts up elsewhere. And so it is here. Viewed geographically one can observe a movement from west to east. The South and West are areas where mission interest predominates. Only in the Palatinate and in part in the Swiss societies is there strong Brethren's fellowship (bruederische Gomeinschaftsleben); in Middle and North Germany, also in Silesia it has declined very much; in Scandinavia it has almost died out; perhaps it can be revived; in Schleswig-Holstein, especially in Jutland, it means working along side of others. The great strides of the past century belong to the East, with the exception of the Baltic provinces.[4]

Then after going into some detail of the development of the Diaspora in Russian Poland and in the Warthe and Netze districts of Eastern Germany, he continues:

> And so the Diaspora work, the dying out of which one had begun to think about, took on a mighty upswing. . . .The pessimism and the defeatism, under which the work had suffered, has to a considerable extent diminished during about the past fifteen years. Diaspora workers have been trained in the mission school, the Diaspora conferences set-up, a Sunday paper started, and a training course for leaders of meetings begun in Herrnhut. At the same time and as a result of all this there has increased in the congregations a love, or at least a respect for the Diaspora.[5]

---

4. *Zeitschrift zur Bruedergeschichte*, 1911, p. 184.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 186.

World War I naturally proved to be a serious strain for the German Moravian Church. Its close ties with the English and American branches of the Unity were almost completely disrupted during the course of hostilities. German missionaries in enemy colonies or in conquered German colonies were either sent home or interned. With all of their home work on the European continent administered from Herrnhut, the Brethren were in a difficult situation. Yet there was a surprisingly rapid recovery afterward. The German Moravian Church on the eve of World War II was probably in as flourishing a state as it was at the outbreak of the earlier world conflict.[6]

The first World War may actually have helped the overall picture, for it hastened certain adjustments that were on the way, particularly in the direction of decentralization. For the worldwide Moravian Church the war resulted in a decentralization of foreign mission administration, with the two American Provinces, the British Province and the Continental Province each taking responsibility for certain fields. Within the Continental Province, moreover, it tended to shift the center of emphasis from Herrnhut to local and regional areas. Adding to this decentralization was the currency inflation in Germany soon after the war, which made it very difficult to support Diaspora workers outside of the country. The result was that the Moravians in Switzerland, Holland, Denmark and Sweden began to work for a more indigenous brotherhood, small as their numbers were.[7] Poland with the most extensive Diaspora of all was economically even

---

6. Total membership on January 1, 1914 was 8,356 for twenty-four congregations in Germany, Denmark, Holland and Switzerland; 1,239 for six congregations in Czechoslovakia; and 70,000 as the estimated figure for the Diaspora in the above countries and in Baltic Russia. On January 1, 1940 the total membership was 9,909 for twenty-five congregations in Germany, Denmark, Holland and Switzerland; 5,935 for fifteen congregations in Czechoslovakia; and 30,000 for the Diaspora exclusive of Baltic Russia. These figures are from the statistical appendix of *Moravian Daily Texts* for the years 1915 and 1940, pp. 195 and 251 respectively.

7. *The Jahrbuch der Bruedergemeine*, 1928, reports Moravian work in these countries as follows: Switzerland, three congregations with a total of 600 members, one girls' school and six Diaspora circuits; Holland, two congregations with 400 members, but with a wide circle of mission supporters; Denmark, one congregation of 300 members, two Diaspora circuits and a nationwide mission following; Sweden, two very numerically small Diaspora circuits.

more depressed than Germany and during the time when she was cut off from the latter received aid both in money and in Diaspora personnel from Switzerland. In general the effect of the crisis was to deepen a sense of responsibility to the foreign missions of the church. From Denmark especially came help in the form of both personnel and money for the mission fields in Africa. Holland assumed increasing responsibility for the field in Surinam.

A very tangible evidence of the state of affairs came in the year 1920 with the separation of Diaspora funds from foreign mission funds as a matter of administrative procedure.[8] Hitherto the Diaspora had not been a self-supporting enterprise, costing about twelve thousand marks annually for some years before the war, over and above income for Diaspora purposes.[9] This was justified because it was recognized that the Diaspora agents were also in most instances foreign mission agents. With the inflated costs the church was no longer in a position to meet the Diaspora deficit. The new arrangements were to operate as follows: (1) Diaspora funds were to be restricted to those districts that were still distinctly Diaspora fields in the original sense. This territory had been largely reduced to the circuits in Poland and the Warthe-Netze Bruch regions of Eastern Germany. (2) Those districts which were primarily interested in Moravian missions should be maintained as part of the administrative expense of missions. (3) Diaspora circuits which apparently were not fields of mission interest, and where because others were doing the work, Moravian Diaspora work would be superfluous, should be vacated. (4) Local congregations were urged to be more zealous in carrying on Diaspora work on their own responsibility in their localities.

Though a program of retrenchment, this new policy placed the work on a sounder basis. A study of the field reports and the annual reports of the church's governing board[10] show a continuing healthy morale in the years following. Struggling posts

8. P. Th. Jensen, *Unser Diasporawerk*, 1920, p. 5. In this pamphlet, the author, himself a member of the church's executive board, discusses in detail the situation of the Diaspora at that time.

9. Income for the Diaspora came from the annual offerings in the congregations on the Sunday after Pentecost, from the Diaspora members themselves and from endowment funds.

10. *Mittheilungen aus der Brueder-Gemeine*, 1926 through 1939.

were vacated, or served from the nearest remaining circuit. Promising fields were cultivated with new vitality, and even new communities reached. A few of the local congregations, notably Niesky, took the initiative in doing Diaspora work of their own. The new administrative arrangement was part of the more "realistic appraisal" referred to earlier.

It took quite some time, however, for the distinctions among the different Diaspora circuits to be formally recorded in the statistical year book. Not until the 1933-34 edition of the *Jahrbuch der Bruedergemeine*[11] is the account of the work sub-divided. Prior to that year the same description had been reprinted for the annual editions for over thirty years. From then on the Brethren under the term Diaspora include four divisions: (1) Districts in which the fostering of fellowship predominates (Gebiete in denen die Gemeinschaftspflege im Vordergrund steht). The areas in which this work is reported are in the Prussian territories of Neumark, Brandenburg, and Grenzmark, with a total of four circuits; in Poland, six circuits; in the Palatinate, on the left bank of the Rhine, two circuits; in the vicinity of Herrnhut, one circuit; and in Lower Lusatia, one circuit. (2) Districts in which free evangelization predominates (gebiete in denen freie Evangeliumsverkuendigung ueberwiegt). This type of work is located in six areas, namely, in Niesky (in Silesia) and vicinity, in Upper Lusatia, in Hannover and Altmark, in Middle Germany, in East Pressia and in Denmark. The one in Middle Germany had three circuits, the others one each. (3) Posts occupied by mission agents (Missionsvertreterposten). These stations are to be found in the Free State of Saxony, in Wuerttemberg, the Upper Rhine, and the Middle and Lower Rhine. The most extensive field was in Wuerttemberg with four circuits, the others having only one each. (4) Districts with their own stamp (Gebiete mit eigenem Gepraege). These districts were in Switzerland, both German and French, with the latter extending its work into France; and in Sweden. The work in Switzerland was located in seven centers, and in Sweden in three, though on a very limited scale in the latter country.

11. Prior to the year 1927 this was known as *Brueder Kalender.*

We note from these divisions that Bauer's observations of 1911 still applied. The locale of Diaspora work in the original sense of the word (Gemeinschaftspflege) had moved eastward. Of the five sub-divisions of this phase of the work only one was in the West. Reading between the lines of the various reports, one is led to conclude that the reason for eastern Germany and Poland remaining more purely Diaspora territory is that in this area the rival groups mentioned in the previous chapter were less active. Hence the Brethren, having less competition, found more response to their type of ministry. Here it was still possible to count on a more or less regular membership and attendance. The worker serving here found his assignment similar to that of the pastor of a congregation. In quite a number of these communities the work centered around a building owned by the Diaspora. Another conjecture is that, being more rural, these people of eastern Germany and Poland had fewer urban distractions than those in the West and were more easily reached.

The Diaspora of the second category was in areas, with local exceptions, of course, where other free church groups, independents, or societies with the state church itself, had gained a strong foothold. Here the Diaspora agent was really an itinerant evangelist. His following was not that of regular society members, but composed of those who came to hear him as a guest preacher in the state churches friendly to him, or in free churches. In his contacts with people he would be regarded by them as one who went around helping local pastors to do special work, such as appearing to the unchurched, visiting shut-ins, visiting jails, distributing tracts, and other inner mission work.

The workers designated exclusively as mission agents differed from those in the second category in that their solicitation for missions was direct, instead of indirect, though the methods and status of the two differed little. The mission agent was invited to appear in churches, or in private homes, not as an evangelist, but simply as the Moravian mission agent. It was his responsibility to collect the mission contributions from the non-member friends of the Moravian Church.

Concerning the Diaspora in Switzerland and Sweden, designated as "Districts with their own stamp," we may characterize it as an organized Moravian fellowship, differing from the Diaspora in eastern Germany and in Poland by being self-contained. The eastern field in contrast was in the category of a home mission evangelization enterprise, requiring help from the church as a whole. In Sweden the Diaspora owned and still owns a large office building in Stockholm, which provides sufficient revenue to support two or three agents for Moravian work in that country. Otherwise the Brethren would have abandoned their work in Sweden years ago.[12]

In Switzerland the work was on a flourishing basis, with seven or eight societies carrying on an extensive program of mission meetings, youth conferences, Sunday School work, observance of Moravian festival days, etc. Special rallying events listed in the *Jahrbuch* were the annual mission festivals in Zurich and Montmirail, and an annual gathering of friends of the Moravian Church in Greifensee, Canton, Zurich.

Looking at the overall picture, as presented in the *Jahrbuch*, we find the numerical strength of the Diaspora for the year 1933 to be the following: Society members, 4000; friends, 4000; visitors, 55,000.[13]

Non-Resident Members and Friends

In order to get a true picture of the development of the Moravian Diaspora up to the present day one must go beyond the survey of the work technically designated as Diaspora. First to note along this line is "The Work Among Non-Resident Members and Friends of the Brethren's Church," (Die Arbeit unter den auswaertigen Mitgliedern und den Freunden der Bruedergemeine).[14] The term "auswaertige Geschwister," is one of the older terms for the Diaspora members, and the designation "auswaertige Geschwister und Freunde" is common in early

12. Jensen, p. 26.
13. The "friends" refer to definitely listed supporters of Moravian enterprises, those who would be on the mailing list for Moravian publications, while "visitors" are those who merely attend meetings and the support Moravian causes anonymously.
14. *Jahrbuch*, 1927, p. 34.

records of synodal proceedings. During the nineteenth century it was used less and less and usually still in connection with the Diaspora. In the year book beginning in 1927 we see the non-resident members and friends listed in a category of their own. Yet it is difficult to determine any real difference between the nature of this category of Moravians and those of the Diaspora as far as a program of activities is concerned.

The explanation seems to lie in the fact that the Moravian Church on the Continent was beginning to make a concerted effort to keep in touch with its growing number of non-resident members. The *Jahrbuch* for 1927 lists a total of 9450 members in twenty-four congregations.[15] Of these 3509, well over one-third, were non-residents. The Moravians, with the majority of their people in peaceful, small-town settlement congregations, had long been faced with the problem of a shifting population attracted to the cities. It was either keep in touch with those who left the settlements or face continuing decline. Apparently from the standpoint of maintaining morale it was unwise to allow these non-residents to become mere Diaspora members, hence their classification as non-residents. Furthermore in keeping up contact with these non-residents a circle of friends would be included, hence the two-fold nature of this group within the Brethren's sphere of influence.

The period between the two wars saw a relatively extensive growth in this effort. In the 1927 report there were six cities listed in which there was an organized society of non-resident members and friends, with its own regular meeting place for services ranging in frequency from weekly to monthly. These cities were Basel, Bern, and Zurich, in Switzerland, and Forst, Koenigsberg, and Stettin, in Germany. In fourteen other cities there was no organized society, but stated meetings, in some cases monthly, in others only twice a year. The places, all in Germany, were Brunswick, Elberfeld, Erfurt, Essen, Frankfurt, Freiburg, Goerlitz, Halle, Hannover, Hildesheim, Karlsruhe, Leipzig, Mannheim and Stuttgart.

---

15. *Ibid*., pp. 34-35.

A decade later[16] there were nine cities in the first group, with Bachenbuelach and Menziken added to those in Switzerland, and Freienstein-Rorbas and Sommerfeld to those in Germany. Stettin was this time in the second group which now numbered twenty-nine cities, the fourteen new places being Embrach, Glogau, Hirschberg, Jena, Kassel, Cologne, Kottbus, Bad Landek, Oberschema-Schneeberg, Liegnitz, Marburg, Munich, Nuremberg and Zwickau.

Activities of these groups included preaching services, song services, prayer meetings, mission meetings, children's services, observance of the Lord's Supper, Bible study hours, Passion Week[17] services, lovefeasts. All of these types of gatherings could be found in most Diaspora meetings also. There probably was considerable overlapping between Moravians of this classification and those of the Diaspora proper.

Statistics show that the problem of non-residence grew more serious in the years immediately preceding the second world war. By 1936 the total church membership had grown to 9708,[18] an increase of only 258 during the preceding decade. But of these the non-residents now numbered 3976, an increase of 467. In preceding pages it was stated that in the administrative changes of the year 1920 congregations were urged to undertake more Diaspora work on their own responsibility. This was done to a certain extent, but more noticeable from then on is the effort of the local congregations to keep in touch with non-residents and friends. Reports through the years show an increasing number of special services for these folks, affairs which we in America would call "home-coming festivals."

Society of Friends of the Moravian Church

As part of this outreach there was organized in 1931 the "Society of Friends of the Moravian Church," (Verein der Freunde der Bruedergemeine).[19] It is described in the following

16. *Jahrbuch*, 1935-36, pp. 108-109.
17. The common Moravian designation for Holy Week, observed by the Brethren throughout the world by the reading aloud of the story of Christ's last week on earth as compiled from the Gospels in a book called the *Passion Week Manual*.
18. *Jahrbuch*, 1935-36, p. 92.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 110.

terms:

> In the course of the year 1931 there arose in all quietness a Society of the Friends of the Herrnhut Brethren's Church with headquarters in Herrnhut. Such evangelical Christians have joined who are of the conviction that the Brethren's Church has a purpose to fulfill not only on the foreign mission field, but also within our nation and within Christendom in general. Their wish is that the Brethren's Church carry out this task according to her endowments. For this purpose the members support the Brethren's Church with their contributions. The membership up to now is about 1500.[20]

The Brethren's Youth Society

Closely related to the Diaspora was the "Brethren's Youth Society," (der bruederische Jugendbund).[21] Again we refer to the *Jahrbuch* for an insight into this organization:

> In the winter of 1910-11 young men and older boys in Herrnhut were so gripped by the Lord that they began to be active for Christ among Moravian youth. The Brethren's Youth Society is the result of this awakening. As a fruit of the activity of this Society, working through a full time agent, through annual youth days, through the efforts of the members, there arose in the settlement congregations Bible study groups among the boys and girls as well as among the young adults. Groups already in existence took on new life. The Society worked especially to unite these groups into a definite organization. Its aim is to awaken and foster faith and life in Christ. The Society's agents in the beginning itinerated in the congregations and in the Diaspora societies. Now the chief work is being done in the Warthebruch region where there are twenty-seven youth societies with 350 members.

The Brethren's Trombone Choir League

A most interesting organization of the Moravians in Germany is the Brethren's Trombone Choir League (der bruederische Blaeserbund),[22] composed of members of the trombone choirs[23] in

---

20. The interest in and support of Moravian causes by members of other churches is paralleled by a similar situation in the case of the Society of Friends. The Quakers, like the Moravians, a very small group numerically, are able to carry on their extensive humanitarian activities because of the support of many persons outside their own membership. However, there does not seem to be any influence of the one group upon the other. The two groups have developed quite independently of each other. The fact that both attract the loyalty of outsiders is evidence that a small group unselfishly serving mankind, not seeking its own aggrandizement, tends to evoke the support of earnest members of the Christian community in general.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 135

22. Ibid., p. 137.

23. The playing of trombones from the church belfry for festival occasions

the congregations and Diaspora societies. It is purely an informal association of those who feel the kinship existing among the men and boys who play in Moravian trombone choirs. Growing out of a suggestion of several members of the Gnadenfrei congregation in 1924, the idea soon spread to other communities. Highlights in the life of the league have been annual music festivals in the different Moravian centers, such as Neuwied, Kleinwelke, Gnadenfrei.

Not only did the league instill new morale into the trombone choirs, but it served as a rallying point for scattered Moravians and their friends. It was another one of the techniques used by the church in maintaining itself.

The Moravian Daily Texts

A detail of the worship life of Moravians and their friends hallowed by 220 years of tradition is the use of a little devotional manual entitled *Daily Texts*.[24] In the early days of Herrnhut Count Zinzendorf began the practice of selecting a verse of Scripture as a guide for each day's prayer, speech, and general conduct. Soon this was supplemented with a few lines from hymns. In the first years these Scripture verses and hymn stanzas were announced for the following day at the daily evening service. In 1730 a collection of such "Watchwords" and "Doctrinal Texts" was printed for the entire following year, a practice continued without interruption ever since. The first English set of *Daily Texts* appeared in 1743.

After various changes the manual finally assumed the form which it bears today. Two texts of Scripture and two hymn stanzas are used for each day. The so-called "Watchword" is always from the Old Testament, and the "Doctrinal Text" from the New Testament. In addition there are references for daily reading of the Bible itself, on Sundays the designated lessons being the pericopes of the ancient church year. Memorial and

---

and for the announcement of deaths has for over two centuries been one of the unique Moravian customs, not only in Germany, but all over the Moravian world. In some places the instruments are restricted to trombones, but in most places where the custom still prevails various wind instruments are used.

24. In German the book is known as *Die Losungen* or *Das Losungsbuch* from the fact that the Old Testament text for the day is selected by lot from a large collection taken out of the Bible for that purpose.

festival days of the Moravian Church are also noted in the volume. Prayer topics are suggested for each day of the week, such as, prayer for missions, the family, schools, the sick and afflicted, the nation, the church, ministers and church leaders.

Private and family devotions of Moravians have for these past two centuries been focused on these Texts which have served as a symbol of the spiritual and fraternal bond among the Brethren throughout the world. Pertinent to a study of the Diaspora is the wide use of the *Daily Texts* outside of the Moravian Church, which use has long been regarded as an index of the wide influence of Moravianism beyond the small numerical membership of the denomination itself. Among the religious literature distributed by the Diaspora agents this little volume ranks first in importance. The following excerpt from the preface to the *Daily Texts* sums up its present status:

> The Text Book until the middle of the 19th century was used almost exclusively in the Moravian Church; but in the last decades, and especially since the close of the recent war, it has been valued by many members of other Churches. Latest figures indicate that 1,189,000 were printed for Germany, Austria and German-speaking Switzerland, 13,000 for French Switzerland and France, 7,658 for America, 3,000 for the British Isles and the West Indies, 7,000 for Denmark, (in addition to these, Denmark prints 30,000 copies of a Scripture calendar, containing the same texts as those of the Text Book), 46,000 for Sweden, 127,500 for Finland, 3,500 for Czechoslovakia, 2,000 for Holland, 3,200 for Surinam and South Africa. There is also an edition in Norwegian, in Esthonian, in Polish, in Hungarian, in Ukrainian and in the Spanish language for Central America—altogether in fourteen European languages.
>
> Thirteen missionary languages are also represented. In South Africa: Afrikaans, Souto, Ovambo, Xosa and Sechwana; in Kynyamwesi for the Unyamwesi people; in Kishuaheli for the region of Lake Nyasa; in Eskimo for the people of Labrador; in Miskito for the Nicaraguan Indians; for the Bush Negroes in Surinam; also in Chinese, Japanese, and for the Kols in India—the last three are used in non-Moravian missions.
>
> The total number of languages is therefore twenty-seven.
>
> The number of readers of this little volume can not be stated even approximately.
>
> The Moravian Church considers it a great favor, received from the Lord, that by the yearly issue of this book it may contribute in ever so small degree to the fulfillment of the Saviour's prayer "that they all

may be one." May all who use the book this year find it a source of daily strengthening, and a bond of peace and union.[25]

It is interesting to note that the greatest growth in the use of the *Daily Texts* has occurred in recent years when the Diaspora has been encountering an array of problems. In fact it would appear that the Brethren have been making special efforts toward a wider distribution of the volume as one of the means of maintaining the Diaspora against growing odds. The *Jahrbuch* in its decription of the Diaspora calls attention to the "gathering of the readers of the *Daily Texts* and other friends of the Brethren's Church and her activities,"[26] as genuine Diaspora work.

In the preface to the German edition of the *Daily Texts* for 1938 we see expressed the attitude of the German Moravian Church toward these readers:

> Today the circle of readers of the *Daily Texts* takes the form of a devotional fellowship, which extends over the whole earth. It is to us a matter of heartfelt concern that this devotional fellowship be a fellowship of life and works. For that reason we rejoice when the readers report to us concerning their lives, and allow us to share what they have experienced of divine leadership and blessing. We pray them, from our side, to remember also the task which the Lord has entrusted to our little Brethren's Church, its Diaspora, its education and rearing of youth, the evangelism of Bohemia,[27] the land of our fathers, and above all, our foreign mission work. Our work is so extensive that it can be continued only if our friends continue to help us. The small band of our Moravian members is not in a position to maintain the program. . . .
>
> Our circle also can and should become a fellowship of service through prayer. Therefore we remind our readers of the specific subjects designated in the *Texts* for daily united prayer and thanksgiving. No one should think that the designated subjects for prayer are a hard and fast requirement, but for many they are a help, and at the same time it is a blessed thought to know that others are praying for the same thing and uttering the same thanksgiving to God on the same day.[28]

---

25. *Moravian Daily Texts*, Bethlehem, Pa., 1950, from the preface.
26. *Jahrbuch*, 1935-36, p. 127.
27. A reference to the home mission work of the Moravians in Bohemia begun in 1867.
28. *Losungen*, 1938, from the preface.

What the situation was with reference to the *Daily Texts* before World War II is even more true today, as the figures of distribution reveal, the greatest increase having come since the war. The wholesale disruption of life in Europe has made devout Christians appreciate even more than before the devotional guide published by the Brethren. The *Daily Texts* were widely distributed among German prisoners of war in Soviet Russia, and today the same may be said concerning the mass of displaced persons. Recent reports[29] of the German Moravian Church continue to emphasize that without the help of the readers of the *Texts* the work of the church could not continue. Illustrative of the situation is a reference in a church periodical to one of the German Moravian officials, Bishop Baudert, visiting congregations of state churches in the Eastern Zone of occupation "where he evangelized and spoke at meetings of the readers of the *Daily Texts*."[30]

The Health Resort at Bad Boll

Bad Boll, a renowned health resort in the Black Forest of Wuerttemberg is another conspicuous example since 1920 of the work of the Moravian Church in Europe apart from its organized congregations. As a health resort Bad Boll goes back to the career of Johann Christopher Blumhardt,[31] Lutheran pastor of the parish in Mottlingen. Beginning in 1834, he demonstrated unusual power in the realm of faith healing, with the result that in a few years he was besieged from all sides with calls for help. In 1853 Blumhardt purchased the royal watering place of Boll, which soon became an asylum for sufferers of all kinds and from all classes of society.

A son, Christopher Blumhardt, also a Lutheran pastor, continued the work upon his father's death in 1880. Though not as gifted as the father, the son developed the institution into a place which furnished physical and medical care in a quiet restful Christian environment.

29. Heinz Renkewitz—*Die Bruedergemeine ihr Auftrag und ihr Gestalt*, Stuttgart, 1949, p. 46.

30. Hartmut Beck—"Diaspora Work in Germany," an article in *The Moravian*, June 3, 1950, p. 5. The author was an exchange student at Moravian Theological Seminary in Bethlehem during the year 1949-1950. Now studying at Tuebingen, he is a frequent contributor to *The Moravian* with his eye witness accounts of the Moravian Church in Germany.

31. The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, II, p. 206.

What was to happen to Bad Boll as a Christian health resort after the younger Blumhardt passed on? The man himself made provision for that. Apparently he saw in the quiet piety of the Brethren the qualities which would best assure the perpetuation of the institution and accordingly he willed it to the Moravian Church. Since 1920, therefore, the year after Blumhardt's death, the Brethren have been carrying on the work. A doctor and several deaconesses are in attendance. Sulphur and other medicinal baths are available. Increasingly the place has become a center for Christian conferences. Clergymen of both state and free churches, as well as members of lay organizations meet here frequently. Daily prayer meetings are part of the life of the guests and patients at Bad Boll. In the mid-thirties the place was accommodating about 25,000 guests a year.[32]

The facilities and atmosphere of the resort are making a contribution to the revitalization of the German Church in the postwar period. Among the attitudes current among church people is dissatisfaction with the training of ministers in the rarefied intellectual atmosphere of state universities. The necessity of a revision of program is conceded, and a start is being made in the form of training institutes for both ministerial students and Christian lay workers. "Perhaps the two best examples are to be found in the 'Church University' in Berlin and the 'Christian Academy' (for professional groups, labor leaders, artists in various fields, etc.) at Bad Boll in the American Zone."[33]

Since the division of Germany into East and West, Bad Boll has become the headquarters of the Moravian Church in the latter, with Herrnhut remaining the headquarters for the East. Though no Moravian congregation existed at Bad Boll before the war, the nucleus of Moravians forming the personnel, swelled by displaced persons, holds regular church services and is developing into a congregation.

---

32. *Jahrbuch*, 1935-1936, p. 22. This does not mean that many different individuals, but that number of room accommodations used during a year.

33. Stewart W. Herman, Jr., "Germany and Austria," an article in *Christianity Today*, edited by Henry Smith Leiper, 1947, p. 45. Herman before the war was pastor of a Lutheran Church for Americans in the city of Berlin.

The Order of Moravian Deaconesses

Along the line of inner missions the Diaspora program has continued to include this type of ministry in the twentieth century. As noted earlier, much of the work of the Diaspora agents corresponds to what in America would be known as rescue mission work. But the most conspicuous service of the Moravians along this line in the twentieth century has been through its Deaconess Order,[34] technically not Diaspora work, but growing out of the Diaspora ideal. Established in 1866, the order in 1939 comprised 150 deaconesses, with ten buildings at Niesky where the mother house was located. In addition the deaconesses maintained children's homes in Ebersdorf and Gnadenfeld and a vacation resort in Flinsberg. The same deaconesses also furnished the personnel for the Moravian Leper Home in Jerusalem, Palestine, and a part of the personnel for the Moravian Leper Home in Surinam. In Germany they served on the staffs of hospitals, children's homes and old people's homes, most of which were non-Moravian. Before the recent war about half of the deaconesses were scattered throughout Germany, Holland, and Denmark as community nurses.

Members of the order were appointed to their respective positions sometimes by a local church, sometimes by a ladies' organization, sometimes by an individual for the benefit of the poor. While their primary duty was nursing, they often acted as a sort of assistant to the local pastor, particularly in young people's work. Where they worked in non-Moravian communities they were "quiet ambassadors of our Moravian Church among Christians of other denominations."[35]

Alumni of Moravian Schools

An important ally of the Diaspora have been the Moravian schools. In Germany, some of them are run as parochial schools by local congregations, some by the church as a whole. Prior to the war there were twenty such institutions, mostly on the elementary and secondary levels, with upwards of 2000 students in

34. John Fliegel, "Moravian Deaconess Work in Europe," an article in *The Moravian*, March 11, 1950, pp. 1 ff. The author, a Moravian minister in the Mid-West, is a native of Germany and former teacher in a Moravian School in Herrnhut.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

attendance and with a staff of about 300.[36] Approximately two-thirds of the pupils were girls and about two-thirds of the teachers were women.

From the beginnings of the Renewed Church schools were promptly established as part of the church's task. Most of these schools, accordingly, have a venerable tradition. The strong religious emphasis has continued down the years much more strongly, for instance, than has been the case with similar schools in America. Approximately three-fourths of the students have been non-Moravians. Upon going back to their respective communities, alumni carried with them the influence of the Moravian training. Invariably they were to be found among the friends and supporters of the Moravian Church. Many of them became readers of the *Daily Texts*, subscribers to Moravian literature, members of local Diaspora groups.

In 1922 there was organized a Society for Moravian Education (Verein fuer Bruederische Erziehung)[37] whose avowed purpose was to foster and to awaken new interest in the educational work of the Moravian Church, both in the congregations themselves and among friends of the church. There was a local chapter of the Society in most of the congregations. Chief feature of the activity was a large annual meeting of the organization.

Admittedly, however, the very existence of this Society is evidence that the Moravian schools were on the defensive. As has been the case in the United States, public school education has been pushing private schools into the background in Germany. To maintain the church schools on a par with state standards became increasingly difficult for the Moravians. The Nazi regime in Germany with its deliberately competitive activities for youth made the problem more acute. Nevertheless, up to the outbreak of the war, the schools of the Brethren greatly enlarged the circle of the church's influence.

The developments of the twentieth century reveal the problem facing every group like the Moravians. The spontaneity and

---

36. *Jahrbuch*, 1935-36, pp. 111-121.
37. *Ibid.*, 1935-36, p. 121.

enthusiasm of the Diaspora in its younger days has given place to more organization and formalized procedures. Where once the Diaspora was Zinzendorf's "Congregation of God in the Spirit," it is today more and more an association of those who help support the work of the Moravian Church. To be sure, the small size of the church helps to retain informality and warmth. Also, this same small size makes it possible for the Moravians to reach into the membership of the state churches without arousing resentment. However, the very existence of organized groups like "Friends of the Moravian Church," "Alumni of Moravian Schools," "Readers of the Daily Texts," and the "Moravian Trombone League" reveal the need for a conscious effort to perpetuate what is in danger of disappearing. There is still considerable vitality in the Moravian Church and its Diaspora, but it is the vitality of an organization, rather than the vitality of an influence or a way of life and thought, once so characteristic of the Moravians on the Continent. "Gemeine" has given way to "Gemeinde."

CHAPTER VI

The Diaspora in the Russian Baltic Provinces

On the east coast of the Baltic sea, between Poland and the Gulf of Finland, are Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, countries which enjoyed a brief span of thirty years of political independence between the two world wars. Belonging to Russia before the first war, they reverted to her following the second. Here the Moravians for two centuries maintained what was at one time their most flourishing Diaspora field with a membership at its peak of perhaps over 50,000.

The work was concentrated largely in what was formerly Livonia, more recently the northern part of Latvia and the southern part of Estonia. There were also flourishing societies on the Estonian islands of Mohn, Oesel and Dago. The Moravians attempted to establish themselves in Lithuania[1] in 1761, but the effort was of brief duration. The story of the Diaspora in the Baltic area, both because of its relative size and because of its own peculiar set of circumstances merits treatment separate from the Diaspora as a whole.

In 1721 Livonia and Estonia passed from Sweden into the hands of Russia. The population for the most part was a mixture of Letts and Finnish Estonians. However, the ruling and privileged classes were predominantly Germans. Under Sweden the nobility of that country also had achieved positions of prominence in the Baltic states. Nominally Lutheranism was the faith of majority, and when the country came under Russian rule one of the terms of the treaty was that the Lutheran remain the state church.[2] Among the native Estonians and Letts there were also Roman and Greek Catholics. But the prevailing Christianity of the lower classes left much to be desired. Relics of actual paganism survived. For instance, outdoor sacrifices under sacred trees still could be found taking place here and there.[3] Piracy was common

1. Though not carrying on regular work in Lithuania the Brethren often passed through the country on their way to Livonia. Cranz in his *History of the Brethren*, p. 239 says: "In Lithuania, Frederic Boehnisch had in 1733 visited the emigrants from Salzburg, who afterwards were often visited at the request of some ministers, by the Brethren traveling that way to Livonia."
2. Holmes, I, p. 350.
3. *Gemein Nachtrichten*, 1851. I, p. 432ff.

among those who lived on the shore, and robbery among those inland. Schools were practically non-existent. The Baltic states were among the most primitive parts of Europe two centuries ago. Indirectly this was one of the factors in the Moravians going there, for in line with their ideals, the needier the field, the more urgent their reason for entering upon it. In this respect it was in its early stages almost like a foreign mission field.[4]

Among the ruling classes Pietism came to have great influence, the *ecclesiolae* finding welcome here and there in the spacious homes of the nobility. Pietism brought with it a concern over the spiritual destitution of the country as a whole. Aware of what was taking place in Herrnhut, the awakened in Livonia solicited the Brethren for visitors. Thus it was that this northern country was included in the numerous list of places visited by early itinerant Herrnhuters. The first of these visits was made by Christian David and Timothy Fiedler in 1729. David reported that while in Riga, the Livonian capital, they "supported themselves by spinning flax and testified of the Lamb of God."[5] The following year David Nitschmann the Syndic make a similar visit.

These visits were only preliminary, for the Diaspora did not have its beginning in the Baltic states until after the visit of Zinzendorf himself in the late summer of 1736. The Count was moved to undertake the journey in response to cordial and pressing invitations, particularly from Herr von Bohn of Nerva and Lady von Hallert. The latter was the widow of a Polish Saxon who had entered Russian service in 1721.

Arriving in Riga early in September, the Count lost no time in preparing the way for later emissaries from Herrnhut. Immediately he visited superintendent Fischer of the Lutheran Church in Livonia. At Orel he saw General von Campenhausen and his wife. There too he became acquainted with Major von Albedyl, one of the Swedish officers who during captivity in Siberia had occupied themselves with the instruction of children at Tobolsk. This was indicative of the subsequent educational work of the

---

4. Bauer, in *Zeitschrift zur Bruedergeschichte*, 1911, p. 170.
5. E. W. Croeger, *Geschichte der erneuerten Brueder-Kirche*, I, p. 182.

Baltic Diaspora. Among those who entertained him in Livonia was the above mentioned Lady von Hallert who lived at Wolmar. She asked him to send her a chaplain and tutors for a teachers' institute which she had opened at her home. From Wolmar Zinzendorf went to Reval, capital of Estonia, where he had interviews with several pastors and where he preached in the cathedral. Later he preached again in Orel and Riga. In each case there was a general enthusiastic response to the Count's personality and message.

His visit in Livonia and Estonia occupied about a month. Spangenberg says of it:

> He had there an opportunity of explaining his real sentiments to those who were at the head of the church in Livonia; for they did not neglect to hear him themselves, and afterwards affirmed, that they had nothing to object to them.
>
> A chief object which the Count had in view, was private intercourse with those preachers in Livonia, who were desirous of doing good, both among the Germans and Swedes, as well as the Estonians and Lettonians. In these conversations, doctrines were not the only things considered, but the work of grace in the heart, and the Lord added his blessing to them. The Count also particularly recommended to the preachers, Spener's wise idea *de Ecclesiolis in Ecclesia.*
>
> Opportunity having been afforded him of becoming well acquainted with Livonia, he soon perceived there was a want of those who preached Jesus Christ with a warm heart, to the inhabitants to Estonia and Lettonia, and who were able to treat them in a very simple manner, and according to circumstances. Hence, he considered whether a seminary could not be formed for the instruction of such of the Lettonians as showed much talent and ability, so that good schoolmasters might be made of them. Able men being required for this purpose, the Count after his return, sought to procure them, and succeeded so well, that his plan was not only carried into effect, but an extensive awakening also took place. Besides this, many of the nobility and clergy requested of him preceptors for their children, and assistants in the schools and churches, and the Count was able to comply with their wishes.[6]

Before leaving the territory Zinzendorf organized in Reval a society in fellowship with the Moravians.[7] Officers were the Lutheran pastors Michwitz, Vierorth and Gutslaff. In the same

---

6. Spangenberg. p. 219.
7. Hamilton, p. 75

city he was instrumental in the raising of money for the formation of a Bible society and the subsequent printing in 1739 of the Scriptures in the language of the Lettonians.

The response to Lady von Hallert's request for tutors at Wolmar was prompt. The next year five brethren were sent there from Germany. One of these was a recent divinity student at Jena, Magnus Frederick Buntebart. He was placed in charge of the institute at Wolmar and also installed as assistant to Pastor Barlach, the parish minister, after his credentials and qualifications had been approved by the Lutheran superintendent of the district.[8] The success of the institute was immediate. Within a few months it was the center of an extensive religious awakening affecting thousands of the peasantry. The enemies of the Brethren became alarmed at their popularity and instigated an examination by an ecclesiastical court in 1739. This terminated not merely in favor of the institution, but in a hearty endorsement by the authorities. The commission which had thoroughly examined the activities at Wolmar advised many parishes which it subsequently visited to send students there to prepare them as schoolmasters and parish assistants. The result was that the Brethren soon had as many as seventy candidates at a time in their training center. These carried the awakening back to their homes.

In 1740 the place had to be enlarged and a new set of buildings was accordingly erected at a site nearby which came to be known as the Lammsberg, a typical Pietistic designation. In order to minister to the growing number of people seeking after "heart religion" more Brethren had to be brought from Germany. Some of these, like the first five, were educated men who were employed as tutors in noblemen's families or as parish assistants. The Moravians were always careful to comply with the law in presenting their personnel for examination to the superintendent in order to secure his approval. Others of the Brethren were more like the early Diaspora workers in Germany, ordinary workmen and craftsmen, literate but not learned, who while carrying on their occupations instructed natives in the Christian life.

---

8. Holmes, I, p. 351.

Parallel with developments in Livonia was the progress in Estonia. Here too members of the clergy and the nobility encouraged the Brethren in their evangelization and recognized in them an influence for the betterment of their land. Here too some of the Diaspora workers served as teachers, particularly in the collegiate school at Reval.

The widespread revival[9] unfortunately brought trouble beginning in 1741 in Reval. There the head Lutheran pastor Mikwitz, one of the original supporters of the Diaspora, became enthusiastic over its work to the point of indiscretion. Contrary to Diaspora regulations, he actually organized the Reval society into a Moravian congregation, though the members were to partake of the Communion service in the Cathedral once a year. He tried as nearly as possible to introduce the Brethren's church discipline into this congregation. On numerous occasions, including Lutheran synods, he extolled the Moravians. He even tried to introduce Moravian regulations into his Lutheran churches. What was most objected to of all, he allowed Brethren who did not meet the Lutheran standards of training to preach on the most solemn occasions.

Naturally there was concern in Lutheran circles over this threat to church organization, and bitter controversy was soon aroused in Reval. Aggravating the situation were the controversial writings[10] coming from Germany concerning the Count and his activities. Some ministers who had supported the Brethren deserted them out of fear for their own position. In all of this it must be remembered that the territory had been under Russian rule for only twenty years and the authorities were suspicious of subversive elements.

---

9. Accompanying the revival were some of the excesses common to mass religious awakenings. Though the Moravians, as has been clearly shown, have invariably discouraged mass revivals, the awakening among the Livonian and Latvian peasantry for a time assumed this nature. Phenomena such as "revelations," prophetic dreams, speaking with tongues, etc., were reported. This among Lutherans was especially distasteful to the authorities. The demonstrations at this date were, of course, not associated with the Sifting Period. However, when several years later a considerable number of Livonians took up residence at Herrnhaag, they were among those who eagerly joined with the extremists.

10. This was a period in the history of the Moravians when they were bitterly attacked in Germany and Holland by widely circulated polemic tracts.

Had Zinzendorf been in Europe instead of in America at the time, no doubt he would have intervened sooner by cautioning his followers to proceed more slowly. He was not able to devote his personal attention to the situation until late in 1743. But a year before, while the Count was still on the other side of the Atlantic, the Countess made a vain attempt to smooth the way for the Brethren in Russia. In the fall of 1742 she first made an extended visit to Denmark in behalf of Moravian missions in Danish possessions. Thence she proceeded to Livonia, staying for some weeks with Lady von Hallert. There she reminded the Diaspora workers and native assistants with whom she met at a lovefeast that they were merely helpers and were not to presume upon their position in usurping pastoral functions. Her impressions of the status of the Brethren in the Baltic made her perceive the need for acquainting official circles with the true picture. Though by this time it was January in Russia, she resolved to go to St. Petersburg on behalf of the Moravians. There she remained until the end of March "where she gave to several persons of rank at the imperial court a true idea of the Brethren in general, and of the work of God in Livonia in particular."[11] Upon hearing of the return of her husband from America she left Russia to rejoin him in Germany.

The good intentions of the Countess were apparently misunderstood. Many uninformed detractors accused her of being part of a plot to foment disturbance against the government in Livonia. Soon the authorities began to take unfavorable notice, apparently appraising the situation along these lines:

> This was the status of the affair in the year 1742. The school houses of the Herrnhuters turned out to be more and more prayer halls which under the leadership of the Brethren became secret gathering places for congregations which alienated themselves from the church to which for the most part they felt themselves bound only formally by law and by virtue of their being citizens, and from which by disregard of church rules and regulations and by special services and discipline of their own they shut themselves off.[12]

At this juncture the general ecclesiastical superintendent

---

11. Cranz, p. 295.
12. Th. Harnack, *Die Lutherische Kirche Livlands und die Herrnhutische Bruedergemeine*, p. 75.

Fischer, until then rather tolerantly disposed, began to change his attitude. He had read the literature of the Moravians, examined their principles and become well acquainted with them. Yet in June of 1742 he ordered a formal investigation of complaints against them. In his introductory remarks ordering the investigation Fischer says that he had received the Brethren with joy in the beginning. Since then he had learned a number of things which made him suspicious of their good intentions. Specifically his attention had been called to the following irregularities:

1. Where the peasantry was being taught by the Brethren the catechism was being abandoned, and doctrine was being taught only according to the "feelings of the heart."

2. Under a certain Pastor Biefer, a Herrnhuter who by profession was a wig maker, congregations were being organized according to the Herrnhut pattern. These were being governed and taught by elders who were mere peasants.

3. The craftsmen (Handwerksleute) from Herrnhut as well as the so-called awakened peasants engage in all sorts of unorthodox behaviour in activities related to the church.[13]

The first step was a request to all the provosts of both the Estonian and Latvian parts of Livonia to investigate thoroughly each parish to determine to what extent the work of the Herrnhuters had been going on. The ecclesiastical, more or less informal investigation, was followed early in 1743 by the appointment of two government commissions composed jointly of ecclesiastical and civil members, one to investigate the Latvian and the other the Estonian district.[14]

Before these commissions had time to act an imperial edict was issued by Elizabeth from St. Petersburg on April 16, 1743, reading as follows:

> It has been brought to the attention of her royal majesty that a new sect called the Herrnhuters has arisen in Livonia, whose founder is a certain Countess Zinzendorf. The sect has so multiplied that already large buildings have been erected, especially in the vicinity of Dorpat, for the gathering of those who follow it in Livonia, and meet-

13. *Ibid.*, p. 78.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 81.

> ings are held in secret. Among the members of the sect are a group of Livonian nobility, pastors and especially peasants. Therefore be it ordered that the Livonians, be they who they may, be forbidden to continue to adhere to the teachings of the Herrnhuters; that their buildings be closed, and that gatherings, whether in such buildings or elsewhere be forbidden.[15]

Accordingly two orders issued on May 7 and 11 respectively placed the work of the Brethren under ban. Some months later the two commissions presented their reports, and on November 23, 1743, the final decree against the Moravians was issued by the governor general's office in Riga. Not only were the prayer halls closed, but also those Brethren, some forty to fifty in number, who had come from Germany were ordered to leave the country. All communication with them by letter was forbidden as well as the admission of their literature into the country. Their song books and Bibles were confiscated. Thus seemingly ended the first phase of the Moravian Diaspora in Baltic Russia.

Zinzendorf, however, was unwilling to admit defeat and resolved to intervene personally by offering himself for examination before a commission both in Riga and St. Petersburg. To prepare the way he sent ahead to St. Petersburg the Reverend Arvin Gradin, a minister of the Brethren who on a previous occasion had represented the church in negotiations with the Russian government. Gradin was promptly arrested and was to remain in custody for the next four years.[16]

Though the Count soon learned of the arrest of his envoy, he determined to go through with his mission and to take his son Christian Renatus with him. They arrived in Riga on December 23 and on the following day were promptly put into custody. It was a fortunate detention, for it spared the Count what would have been undoubtedly more serious difficulty had he been permitted to go on to the capital. Upon arriving in Riga Zinzendorf had sent one of the Brethren named Weiss to Governor Laski,

---

15. *Ibid.*, p. 82.

16. At this time three other Brethren, Conrad Lange, Zacharias Hirschel and Michael Kund, were being detained in prison at St. Petersburg. They had been arrested in 1742 when they came to the capital to seek passports for passage through Russia in their effort to establish mission work in China and among the Calmucks enroute. These three and Gradin were released in 1747.

requesting permission to travel to St. Petersburg. Laski replied that he could do nothing without orders from the capital and that in the meantime the Count must have patience because he, the governor, was not at liberty to allow a person of rank to pass without permission. Immediately upon receiving this message the Count's party was conducted to the citadel where he remained in protective custody until January 12. Three days after receiving the empresses orders to quit Russian territory and her statement that she did not deem another investigation necessary Zinzendorf returned to German territory.[17]

Being an enterprise largely dependent upon laymen, the Diaspora was not so easily disposed of. Apparently the order banning the work of the Brethren was not strictly enforced, for the work of the Brethren was not strictly enforced, for the work continued with the blessing of friendly Lutheran pastors here and there and with the assistance of a few members of the nobility responsible for the coming of the Moravians in the first place. Of course Herrnhut had to stay very much in the background during the period from 1743 to 1764 when the ban was in effect, and the native assistants who numbered in the hundreds assumed the burden of leadership. There were no Diaspora ministers openly at work in Livonia during these years. But there were tutors in private homes, craftsmen in shops, peasants on the land who continued the cultivation of "heart religion."

Accounts of Moravian conferences and synods in the years immediately following reveal how the Brethren continued in the field. For instance at a prayer day at Marienborn[18] on August 19, 1744, there appear among the reports five or six excerpts from letters of Diaspora workers in Reval, Riga and Wolmar. At the synod of Zeist[19] in 1746 it was reported in the minutes that the Brethren have connections in thirty-seven communities in Livonia, Estonia and on Oesel. In the catalogue list of Moravian workers throughout the world are included the forty to fifty Brethren in the Baltic states.

17. Cranz, p. 297.
18. "A Prayer Day held the 19th Aug., 1744, in the Chapel at Marienbourn," MS in the Moravian Archives.
19. "Synodus Gehalten in Zeist vom 12ten May—14th Jun, 1746," p. 132, MS in the Moravian Archives.

An interesting reference in a letter read at a conference in Herrnhaag[20] in 1744, requests the itinerant Brethren when visiting a community to use only the first, or Christian name in addressing one another, in order to remain more anonymous. As an illustration, the letter cites that whenever Christian David arrives in a place he is the center of controversy, because he is so well known.

Somehow those who had come under the influence of the Brethren managed to stay within the law in giving overt expression to their religious experience. There was one outstanding exception on the Estonian island of Oesel involving four men who paid a high price for their actions. Here the Diaspora had been planted in 1738 under the sponsorship of the Lutheran superintendent Eberhard Gutsleff and a colleague, Francis Hoelterhof. These two clergymen in 1736 had opened a school on their island, which two years later they placed under the direction of Gottlieb Fritsche who, after completing university studies at Leipsig, had joined the Moravians at Herrnhut in 1737. Prior to his coming to Oesel Fritsche had been a tutor of noblemen's children and until the ban of 1743 had been a Diaspora leader in the Baltic states. The fourth individual was the physician David Kruegelstein who had come to Livonia as a Diaspora worker in 1738. Subsequently he had established his medical practice at Brinkenhoef on Oesel. Already at the time of the disturbances of 1742-1743 Gutsleff and Hoelterhof had been under the surveillance of the authorities for their Moravian connections.

In 1748, relative to the above mentioned school, Kruegelstein entered into correspondence with Fritsche and Gutsleff. Since they had been under suspicion for illegal religious activities, their mail was watched. Two letters, one of Kruegelstein to Gutsleff and the other of Fritsche to Kruegelstein, were the basis for an accusation of treason. By reading certain meaning into some scriptural quotations in the letters the accusers of the Brethren were able to make out a case that the latter were in league with the Swedes. Reference to Christ as "the refuge of the oppressed," [21] in a quotation from a hymn was construed as meaning

20. "Extracts from some of the Herrnhaag and Marienborn Prayer Days—De A. 1744," MS in the Moravian Archives.

21. Holmes, I, p. 357.

the opposite rocky coast of Sweden which might serve as a place of refuge to the Estonians if persecuted in Oesel.

The four men were shortly arrested and sent to a St. Petersburg prison. Gutsleff died there the following year. The other three were kept in custody in the capital, sometimes in close confinement and again in comparative freedom, for another ten years. In 1759 they were transferred to the distant city of Kasan where they were allowed considerable liberty. The physician resumed his practice there, and the other two served as teachers in an academy. Fritsche and Kruegelstein died within a few weeks of each other in late 1760. Only Hoelterhof[22] lived to regain his full freedom which he obtained in 1762. During all of these years the Brethren never had a formal trial other than the preliminary hearing before local magistrates at the time of their arrest.[23]

A new era for the Moravians in Russia came in 1762 with the accession of Catherine II who launched a policy of encouraging colonization on a large scale by guaranteeing liberty of conscience, religious freedom and exemption from taxes and military service to immigrants for a number of years. The Brethren were among those who were solicited for settlement on Russian soil. Even during the latter days of Elizabeth, under whom the Diaspora had been suppressed, Moravian settlements had come under favorable observation during the course of the Seven Years' War. General Zacharias von Czerntscheff during his campaigns in Silesia had personally observed the integrity and thrift of Moravian settlements.[24] He went so far as to have his brother Ivan, a responsible official of the empire, approach the leaders of the Moravian Church concerning the establishment of a settlement in Russia. With their rebuff in Livonia fresh in mind, the Brethren were unimpressed and nothing came of the overture.

---

22. The story of Hoelterhof has a rather happy sequel. Upon his release he would have preferred returning to his parish at Jamma on Oesel Island. But as a condition of his reinstatement was the severance of all connections with the Brethren he retired to Moscow. There he soon received an appointment as professor of German in the recently founded university. Later when the Moravians were restored to favor in Russia he rendered helpful service to them in Moscow.

23. The details of the experiences of the above four men are from Cranz, pp. 493-497, and Holmes, I, pp. 353-363.

24. Hamilton, p. 208.

Their answer was couched in these terms:

> Considering the well known events, which, during these twenty years past, had occurred in the Russian empire, with respect to the Brethren, and considering so many accusations against them brought before her imperial majesty, though the Brethren never yet had an opportunity of evincing their innocence; they could not see what use could be made of such an overture. And in general the Brethren could not settle in any country, before a previous examination, and the approbation of the sovereign.[25]

With Catherine on the throne Czernstscheff renewed his invitation. The Brethren insisted upon a thorough investigation of themselves by a royal commission and a definite written statement setting forth the conditions upon which they could settle in Russia. The Empress agreed and sent a representative to Herrnhut the following year. He returned to Russia accompanied by the Brethren Paul Layritz and John Loretz who were to represent their church before the royal commission which Catherine had in the meantime appointed. Members of the commission were Count Orloff and Archbishop Demetrius of Novgorod. The body reported favorably to this effect: the Unity of the Brethren was recognized as adhering to the Augsburg Confession, as an ancient and legitimate church, and possessed of regulations and discipline after the pattern of the primitive church.[26]

Following this event an imperial edict bearing the date of February 22, 1764, was sent to all the governors of the Russian provinces and published in the newspapers. Among other things the edict stated this:

> A most gracious permission is granted to the *Unity of the Evangelical Brethren*, to come into the empire and to enjoy a full liberty of conscience, religion, and church constitution, according to their own discipline, as laid by them before the synod. . . .And thus, we receive all the Brethren of the Unity, as many as have either already settled, or shall hereafter settle, in our whole empire, into our most sublime protection.[27]

---

25. From a letter of the church's governing board to the Russian government, cited by Cranz, p. 525.

26. Cited by Cranz, p. 526. Among the documents studied by the commission were various papers dealing with the trouble in Livonia, including those seized from Zinzendorf during his detention in Riga. These were an important factor in favorably impressing the examiners.

27. *Ibid.*, pp. 526-527.

At the time of the issuance of this edict Catherine encouraged the Moravians further by presenting them with a spacious house and premises in St. Petersburg for the accommodation of members coming into the country. Along with this was given assurance of liberty to fit part of it for a chapel and to hold religious services according to their own ritual.[28] This laid the foundation for a thriving Diaspora society in the Russian capital, which continued until the late nineteenth century under the same administration as the work in Livonia.

Though the concessions granted to the Moravians in the venture in Astrakan[29] had no direct bearing upon the situation in the Baltic provinces, it meant a new era for the Diaspora in the latter region. There was not at this stage, and there was not to be until 1817, any official pronouncement reversing the suppression of the Brethren. Nevertheless the ban became a dead letter. The invitation to establish Moravian settlements in Russia with guaranteed freedom of religion was construed also as freedom to resume open evangelization within the Lutheran Church. When occasionally thereafter local unfriendly state pastors or local magistrates reminded higher authorities that the Moravians were carrying on illegal actions their complaints were lightly dismissed.

Even before the end of Elizabeth's reign the work had staged a comeback. The case of the four men from Oesel, as previously stated, was an exception to the trend of events. Already in 1756 Peter Hesse, superintendent of the field, reported to Zinzendorf that in Estonia the Brethren stand in connection with over one hundred Germans among whom were fifty persons of the nobility, two provosts and eight pastors. About 8000 nationals were under their spiritual leadership, with children, over 10,000

---

28. Holmes, p. 49.

29. At the synod of 1764 the Moravians on the strength of the Russian promise voted to establish a settlement near the mouth of the Volga in Astrakan, which was effected in 1766. There, fifteen hundred miles from the other Moravian settlements in Europe, the Moravian town of Sarepta existed until 1892 when, because of local political difficulties over church property rights, the Moravians severed their connection with the place and it was absorbed into the Lutheran Church. The strategy in locating in this far-off part of Russia was that it might serve as a base for mission work among the Calmucks and Tartars of the region, but because of the continued opposition of the Orthodox Church this was never accomplished.

persons in all. For Livonia Hesse reported about fifty Germans, half of them of the nobility, one a provost and three pastors. The number of nationals, however, was much smaller, being about 2600.[30]

We have comparatively little information[31] from the field during these and for many years thereafter because the Brethren remained in fear of arousing the ever present latent opposition of some of the clergy. The Diaspora leaders compiled only meager reports and avoided publishing anything which might reveal the extensive scope of the work. But what we do know reveals that there was steady progress during the closing third of the eighteenth century and on into the next century.

Evidence of how the field must have been quietly cultivated is furnished by the journal[32] of John Christian Quandt who in 1793 was commissioned by the Unity's Elders' Conference of the Brethren to make an official visit. Quandt's father had been one of the first of the Lutheran pastors to welcome the ministry of the Moravians among his people. The son had gone to Germany where he became a Moravian minister. Now as a member of the church's governing board he made an extensive tour of the Diaspora societies of his native land. Speaking both German and Estonian, Quandt was able to confer with both the German and the native workers on the field. On one occasion he met with as many as three hundred of the latter, an index of the extent of the enterprise. At his headquarters at Errestfer, an estate of Baron von Ungern Sternberg, he was visited by many persons of high rank who evidenced their friendliness toward the Brethren and who expressed their readiness to cooperate in the religious work among their vassals. Included in Quandt's itinerary was a stay of a few weeks at St. Petersburg where he participated in the life of the flourishing society of that city. While there he revised and prepared for the press the Estonian hymn book. After his visit to the

30. Hermann Plitt, *Die Bruedergemeine und die Lutherische Kirche in Livland*, pp. 160-161.

31. Holmes, p. 126, remarks: "The comparative secrecy with which the Brethren were obliged to conduct their labors, has rendered the means of information far more scanty than the importance of the work would lead us to wish."

32. ————————, *Fortsetzung von David, Cranzen's Brueder Historie*, p. 278-281.

capital Quandt crossed over to the islands of Mohn and Oesel where he likewise was able to report the work of the societies to be flourishing.

It is to be noted that this encouraging period for the Diaspora in the Baltic was paralleled by the same state of affairs in Germany itself. The sway of rationalism in the state churches was of course an underlying reason for the strength of the extra-church societies. In the Baltic provinces the spiritual distance between the clergy and the people was accentuated by the social situation. The church, controlled by the nobility and citizens of high rank and manned largely by German pastors, represented the privileged part of the population. The rank and file were peasants speaking their native language. Characteristic of people with meager cultural opportunities, they responded eagerly to a religious approach that had emotional warmth.[33] They found deep satisfaction in the opportunity for intimate fellowship and self expression in the prayer and testimonial meetings sponsored by the Brethren.

The Moravian custom of church leaders writing their own obituary (Lebenslauf) as they approach their declining years is the source of much useful information in historical studies. A case in point is that of Christian Kohl, one of the native Diaspora helpers in Estonia, who lived from 1790 to 1853. Of peasant background, he had learned the book-binder's trade, and while working at it devoted all of his spare time to religious work. His autobiographical memoir permits us to see the nature of the Diaspora from the point of view of one who was an intimate part of it.

> I was appointed leader of the Single Brethren of the Nawwa Society, and had soon the joy of having them come to me with love and trust. Whereupon I remembered what was said of me by the young boys of the village when I was still a boy. When they all went every fourteen days on Sunday morning at six o'clock to the prayer hall of Nawwa which was an hour away, I would beg them with tears to take me along. Because I was frail they often had to carry me on their backs. One of the boys once said to my brother, who was only half willing that I should always be taken along, "Do you know why

33. Plitt, p. 165, gives as national characteristic of the Estonians and Latvians that of fantasy thinking and deep feeling as evidenced in their national songs. To this type of people the Moravian type of religious expression would naturally have a strong appeal.

> we take him along? Because in time he will be our leader and direct us to the Saviour." Now after years this word had been fulfilled. . . .
>
> In the year 1815 there took place in the village of Nawwa and surrounding territory a great awakening under Brother Silla Hindrik Sulbach. In the same year the construction of the new prayer hall for the Society was begun. . . .Though the new prayer hall was thirty paces long and fifteen paces wide, it still did not accommodate the hearers, for many had to stand outside the doors and windows. Through the providing of prayer halls in several other parishes the over-crowding was later ameliorated. . . .
>
> In the parish of Laisschen, not far from my home, I was urged to hold meetings in the home of a peasant hatter in the village of Painkulla. As far as I knew there was in this village not a single awakened soul. But upon my holding devotional meetings until late fall, there arose by the Lord's grace a great awakening. . . .I was asked to be a teacher in the village. Thereupon I was installed by the pastor at Lais as teacher on November 2, 1815, and had to build from the bottom.[34]

The narrative goes on to tell how Kohl taught the village children in a terribly run-down building which he had to repair himself, how other communities invited him to hold meetings and open schools for their children. The awakenings continued over the years, with other workers coming to help. This humble, self-educated man continued this type of work the rest of his life, though by the time of his death in 1853 the state again had assumed an unfriendly attitude.

The above case is typical of the Baltic Moravian Diaspora in that it calls attention to several features common to it. There is the mention of schools, conspicuous in the program. These can be thought of partly in terms of a substitute for the public schools, but particularly in terms of the equivalent of the American Sunday School. On the Continent such activity is part of the work of Inner Missions.

The extremely early hour of service on Sunday morning, mentioned in the memoir, was necessary to conform to the regulations that meetings were not to interfere with the hours for worship in the established church or with hours of employment. Of course, in most cases there were also services at night during

---

34. *Nachrichten aus der Bruedergemeine*, IX, 1860, pp. 830ff.

the week. Space does not permit elaboration, but the narrator reveals too the abject poverty of the population where he lived, the condition of the majority of the Diaspora members. During the entire period of Moravian work in this territory the peasants were in a state of vassalage to their overlords. Typical of German Pietists, the Moravians worked with the pattern rather than against it.

The prayer halls mentioned above were more typical of the Baltic Diaspora than in any other Diaspora field. At the height of the work there were over 250 such buildings in use. They were usually a large plain structure of wooden blocks, consisting of one large room and a vestry.[35] The latter was used for meetings of the national assistants working under their German supervisors. In size these halls ranged in seating capacity of less than a hundred for the smaller ones to nearly a thousand for the larger ones.

Great encouragement came to the Diaspora in Russia in the form of an edict from Czar Alexander I on October 17, 1817. The emperor had in the course of the Napoleonic wars come under the influence of the writings of Madame von Kruedner and Jung Stilling.[36] He had visited Herrnhut in 1813 and had gained an appreciation of the high tone of that settlement. Two of his principal advisors, Prince Galitzin and Count Lieven shared with him the high regard for the Brethren. In fact the latter "was sometimes sneeringly called 'the Moravian'."[37] The edict gave legal recognition to the Diaspora, for, as pointed out previously, the edict of Catherine II concerning colonization did not cover the intra-church work of the Moravians. In part the edict of 1817 read as follows:

> We permit the above members of the Brethren's Church, in accordance with previous practice, for the spiritual welfare and salvation of the Livonians, Estonians and others who desire it, to erect and

35. Holmes, II, p. 231.
36. Madame von Kruedner was a religious visionary and enthusiast born in Riga in 1764. She had a wide following in high circles and was the center of much controversy. Under the influence of the Moravians she began to direct her energy to charitable pursuits until her death in 1824. Stilling was prominent as a writer of popular books for edification and as a mystical apocalyptist. He lived from 1740 to 1817.
37. Hamilton, p. 382.

establish prayer halls in the cities, villages and hamlets, and to hold them under their supervision, with the consent of the owner of the landed property and the knowledge of the civil authorities—and this without hindrance. All who desire are at liberty to assemble in these prayer halls, in accordance with existing usage, at hours other than those set apart for the stated services of the churches, provided it be free time from the obligation to labor. These meetings for prayer, for the reading of the Holy Scriptures and for instruction in morality, shall stand under the supervision and direction of the elders and members of the Brethren's Church.[38]

Just what was the extent of the Diaspora at this encouraging period? Fortunately we have a summary presented to the Moravian general synod at Herrnhut in 1818 by the superintendent of the field, John Ewald.

The field of labor, assigned to the Brethren in this country, is divided into two districts, the Lettonian and the Estonian. Each of these is subdivided into circuits, and each circuit contains several associations, or (as they are called) *united flocks*. The following table exhibits at one view the circuits and the number of associations and members in each circuit.

Lettonian District				
Neuwelke	24	associations	2,858	members
Weberhof	11	"	1,353	"
Birkau	13	"	2,440	"
Lindheim	21	"	3,146	"
Total	69	"	9,797	"
Estonian District				
Dorpat	35	associations	12,554	members
Liebwerth	14	"	2,980	"
Hapsal	7	"	1,310	"
Island of Oesel	13	"	3,353	"
Island of Dago	6	"	1,550	"
Total	75	"	21,757	"

Thus there are in all nine circuits, comprising one hundred forty-four associations, and thirty-one thousand five hundred and fifty-four members. For their service forty-four German laborers and about one thousand native assistants are employed. To these regular Society members must be added nearly ten thousand individuals, who, in one way or other, partake of the religious benefits, resulting from these institutions; besides ninety persons of superior rank, chiefly natives

38. *Ibid.*, p. 382.

of Germany, who are united with the Brethren's Church; which gives a grand total of forty-one thousand six hundred and eighty-eight souls.

The principal station in each circuit, where the German laborers reside, is either a small settlement belonging to the Brethren, or the estate of a nobleman. The laborers derive a very limited support partly from a fund, established for the purpose, and partly from the voluntary contributions, consisting of articles of food, from the peasants. The centre of union is Neuwelke, a small settlement near Wolmar, where the superintendent resides. From this place a regular communication by correspondence and visits, is kept up with the laborers in the several circuits. To them is committed the general superintendence and direction of the work in their respective circuits, and for this purpose, besides making frequent journeys, they hold periodical meetings, or conferences, with the assistants, chosen from the natives. On the latter mainly devolves the spiritual oversight of the associations, the holding of meetings for edification, visiting the members, exhorting, reproving, or admonishing them, as may be found needful. This is the only way, in which, under existing circumstances, that require the avoiding of all unnecessary observation, the work can be carried on, and, by the blessing of God, much good has, in this way, been effected among the peasantry.

Two seminaries for education have been established with good success. A Girl's Boarding-school in 1816 at Neuwelke, and a Boy's school in 1816 at Lindheim. An institution for training schoolmasters, begun in Courland under very promising auspices, was through necessity soon discontinued.

The political situation of both nations has of late been materially ameliorated by wise laws. No nobleman can now treat his tenants arbitrarily, a Court, consisting of three peasants on each estate, being appointed to decide in every criminal action. Still they are in a state of vassalage and, being considered belonging to the soil, have no liberty of removing elsewhere.[39]

Legal recognition meant enhanced status, but it also brought problems. The native assistants became overly aggressive in carrying on their program, and the conservative caution of the forty to fifty German Moravian leaders, so characteristic of the Brethren, was insufficient to keep under proper control the enthusiasm of those working under them. The loyalty of the Diaspora membership to the established church was in danger of becoming only nominal, giving a basis for the ever present criticism of the detractors of the Moravians. The ultra-Lutheran state

39. Holmes, pp. 230-231.

pastors thereby had an opening to look for technicalities in the law through which they might restrict the program of the societies. Actually the Moravian position would have been ultimately better had it not received the legal recognition of 1817.[40] One rather neutral observer feels that the Moravians departed from their true position by becoming in effect a recognized church alongside of one already established:

> The Brethren's Church deserted her divinely appointed calling, in that she allowed herself to be given privileges which gave her a judicial position over against the Church. How could it fail to result otherwise than in collision, to have a recognized church and another independent church, but yet a church with certain privileges within the domain of the former?[41]

At any rate, complaints were soon arising. In response to them the governor-general's office of Livonia in November of 1822 issued an order which put a strict interpretation on the privileges under which the Brethren were working. They were reminded that there were restrictions on the frequency of their meetings (on Sundays outside of church hours and only once during the week) and that the leaders of their meetings were not to itinerate from one parish to another. In May of the following year another statement from the same office objected to the fact that the Brethren were appointing untrained leaders for their conventicles, resulting in all sorts of errors among the ignorant hearers. The statement was accompanied with an order that the name and locality of every prayer hall be registered and that such registration include as nearly as possible the size of the member ship. No new prayer halls were to be erected without the consent of the governor general and notice was to be given to the parish minister of every newly appointed leader of a society. Furthermore, care was to be exercised that no meetings be held during church services, before six in the morning or after eight in the

40. Burkhardt, I, p. 138-139, reminds us that the Unity's Elders' Conference actually discouraged the issuance of a statement of legal recognition on the part of the government. They observed that for a long time the Brethren had been blessed without having such status. They feared what might happen, but because the Czar and his advisors pressed the point they reluctantly accepted the favor granted them.

41. ————Assmuth, in a letter from his *Autobiography*, p. 197, quoted by Harnack, p. 226.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

evening in summer, or before eight in the morning and after six in the evening in winter.[42]

Among the concessions granted to the Brethren by Catherine in 1764 had been freedom from payment of church taxes. Since the Diaspora workers who were from Germany were full-fledged members of the Moravian Church and not native born, they came under this category. Though practically none of the Diaspora members were full-fledged Moravians, many sought such membership and apparently some were being so admitted. The civil authorities became concerned and in July of 1824 issued another order declaring that exemption from church fees applied only to the Brethren who had immigrated to Russia and not to native born members.[43] What confused the issue was the rather uncertain distinction in some societies between Diaspora Moravians and full-fledged church members.

Alexander I died in 1825 and his nephew Nicholas I became ruler. Though not opposed to the Brethren, he lacked the warm admiration for them which his predecessor had, and furthermore he was inclined to ask for sharply defined relationships between church and state. He had the laws of Russia codified in 1830, which is indicative of his method. His attitude is expressed in one of the first pronouncements of the new regime concerning the Brethren, issued on June 11, 1826:

> It is right to allow the Brethren's Church the observance of her customs in the prayer halls which to them supplement the church, but it is not good, and on the side of his majesty will not be allowed, that such meetings be held in private homes. Beyond that it is the duty of the governor-general to observe strictly that this is not used as an excuse to oppose and suppress the Brethren's Church.[44]

Though this seems like a conscious effort to define clearly a controversial situation without partiality, this point of view soon worked to the serious disadvantage of the Brethren. In 1832 the czar granted a new constitution to the Lutheran Church in Russia, which granted more power to the local consistories. A series of legalistic interpretations beginning in 1834 and cli-

---

42. Harnack, pp. 275-276.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 278.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 279.

maxing in 1840 soon placed the Moravians in a very restricted position. Spiritual exercises were to be confined to the reading of Scripture without comment and to the singing of hymns and fixed prayer which had been examined and approved in advance. The administration of the sacraments was prohibited.[45]

An immediate effect of this measure was that of the 255 prayer halls of the Diaspora only twelve remained under the control of the Brethren. The reason for there being twelve left to the Brethren is that they happened to be in charge of ordained Moravian clergymen from Germany who met the prescribed requirements for such a position, by virtue of their training and ordination. But these were limited in their ministry to the locality in which they resided, while before they had been in charge of a circuit including other prayer halls. Had these various measures been strictly enforced the work would have soon come to an end.[46] As it was, an uncertain existence was maintained with ever growing tension between the Brethren and the local church consistories.

The Moravians were indeed in a difficult position. True to their respect for authority, the administrators of the Diaspora made a conscientious effort to carry on the program within the law. But the native assistants were not so inclined and continued to conduct services as they had been accustomed to. When their supervisors urged them to be more cautious they were unwilling to conform. A Diaspora report after the restrictions had been in effect for some years states:

> The Nationals began to ask whether it was right before the Lord to give up what they had long cherished as a special means of grace and which they zealously guarded, for the sake of peace with the state church, and it is hard to make it clear to them that the blessing can remain even if the outer form is taken away, provided the hearts are inclined toward the Lord. . . .It is to be feared the hearts of national helpers are being alienated and made suspicious that we are deserting them because of the fear of men and a desire to conform, and are surrendering their connection without our fellowship.[47]

---

45. Plitt, p. 196.
46. Hamilton, p. 384.
47. *Ueberblick ueber den Gang des Diasporawerkes der Bruedergemeine*, 1859, p. 4.

In 1858 the Brethren had asked the General Consistory for a clarification of their status in the Baltic provinces, and before the end of the year received a reply in which it was specifically stated that the reception of members of the state church into any religious society with its own customers was forbidden, because this carried with it the implication that such a society is necessary to spiritual welfare. At the same time the pronouncement went on to explain that such an interpretation of the law did not mean that the consistory was unaware or unappreciative of what the Diaspora had done in *its day* in the various countries where the Brethren had been active. The consistory declared itself willing to do everything to maintain peace and harmony, but that the work of the Brethren could be of blessing to the church only if it conformed strictly to the law. All tendency to separatism was to be avoided, and the Brethren would be tolerated only if the Diaspora workers were satisfied to be mere assistants to the legally commissioned and responsible pastors.[48]

It is clear from this how delicate was the situation. Obviously the nationals were not satisfied with their position and became disgruntled. The decline of the Diaspora was inevitable. For the next ten or twenty years thereafter we observe the first phase of slow but sure retrogression. The number of agents sent from Germany during this period shrank to about twenty-five, just half of the number during the peak years. The circuits became smaller and smaller. The Brethren began to think seriously of abandoning the field entirely, but always when it came to a decision the church administration decided to hang on and to wait for a possible change in the political situation. Typical of Moravian thinking on the question is a paragraph in the Diaspora report for 1867:

> We glance now at the Baltic privinces of Livonia and Estonia where under hampering restrictions our work is being carried on. The situation has not changed. Our Brethren are resolved not to give any occasion for offense to the Lutheran pastors. But at the same time it remains our concern to labor within our more restricted sphere in serving those souls to whom our church has sent them. It is in behalf of these souls that our church supports the workers at great

48. *Ibid.*, p. 5.

> sacrifice. Should our opponents restrict our activities still more, we would be pressed closer to a decision as to how much longer we can continue the work, and we would have to look around for a possible new field where we can invest our talents.[49]

So the reports continue in the same vein year after year. In time a new note is sounded. The opposition of the Lutheran clergy is less spoken of in the communications from the field, but more and more complaints are voiced of the low state of spiritual life among the Diaspora members themselves. Attendance at the prayer halls was dwindling and the morale generally was low.

> Our formerly thriving work is becoming old and is in need of a thoroughgoing awakening. Where the work is the oldest it has fallen to pieces the most. With every change in generations much spiritual capital goes to waste. The arrangements for fostering the Gospel can be inherited, but not the life itself.[50]

However, about this period an even more ominous note is detected, namely, Russian nationalism, or pan-Slavism as it is also known. This was given impetus with the accession of Alexander III (1881-1894) whose policy has been described as "nationality, Eastern Orthodoxy and autocracy."[51] His policy gave rise to a growing tide of sentiment against the perpetuation of German institutions and customs in the empire. The Lutheran Church with its strong German associations was severely restricted. But this did not give the Moravians more freedom, for they were in the same category.[52] Furthermore the opposition of the Orthodox Church entered the scene in the Baltic states. The alienation of the peasants from the Diaspora leadership, previously spoken of, was augmented by their growing resentment of things German. In 1882 the field report says:

> The clash between the Nationals and the Germans becomes ever sharper. Hatred directed against the nobility and the clergy becomes increasingly bitter. A rabble rousing national press works upon the people and its influence is already showing itself in the better classes. In the Estonian part of Livonia the hatred has given

---

49. *Ueberblick ueber den Gang des Diasporawerkes der Bruedergemeine*, 1867, p. 5.
50. *Kurze Mittheilungen aus dem Diasporawerk der Bruedergemeine*, 1882, p. 7.
51. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, I, 14th ed.
52. The unrest resulting from the upsurge of Russian nationalism forced the Moravian Church to sever its connection with its settlement of Sarepta in Astrakan in 1892.

> rise to arson. One pastor there was even shot at, and the instigators of this deed are supposed to have been school teachers among whom the national party has its most zealous agents, a significant situation for the future of the nation.[53]
>
> Ten years later a report has this notation:
>
> The praying folks in our congregations wait year after year for better news concerning the progress of this old work of the Brethren's Church, but they will understand the wonderful ways of the Lord, even though these again go against our hopes and expectations.[54]

This note is a familiar refrain during the closing decade of the century, a time of rapid deterioration. The few remaining German ministers in the field found it increasingly difficult to obtain the necessary license to carry on their work. Moravian work on the islands of Oesel and Dago came to an end. The girls' school at Lindheim closed its doors in 1893 after an existence of three-quarters of a century. The decisive factor behind this step was the new governmental ruling that all teachers in the institution must henceforth know the Russian language. The Moravians did not have adequate personnel to meet this requirement.[55] The Diaspora program was also becoming a growing financial burden since the political situation had virtually eliminated the patronage of the nobility. As the older workers entered retirement no new workers were sent to replace them. By the turn of the century there were only five full-time Brethren on the field, a number which in the course of a few more years was reduced to three.[56]

The widespread revolution in Russia in the year 1905 proved to be somewhat of a turning point. It was the climax of years of trouble for the Diaspora, but when it was over there seemed to be more optimism for the future, unfortunately cut short by the outbreak of World War I. During the revolution the work, naturally, was in a disrupted state. Many of the prayer halls of the Brethren were actually used for political meetings, those in charge being powerless in the face of popular feeling to prevent such use. The uprising was accompanied by anti-religious and anti-clerical

---

53. *Kurze Mittheilungen aus dem Diasporawerk der Bruedergemeine*, 1882, p. 7.
54. *Kurze Mittheilungen aus dem Diasporawerk der Bruedergemeine*, 1890, p. 29.
55. Apparently the boys' school had come to an end before this, but the writer has not run across any record concerning it.
56. *Brueder Kalender*, 1901, p. 48, and 1911, p. 46.

feeling and some churches and prayer halls suffered vandalism. Happily, the outcome was the granting by imperial edict of religious freedom and freedom of conscience throughout the Russian empire. The Brethren greeted this as the harbinger of a new day for their work.[57]

Included in the greater freedom following the revolution of 1905 was that of minority groups. There was a letup in the program of Russification hitherto so vigorously pursued. In a Diaspora report from Riga we read:

> The Lettonian revolution has stirred up the Baltic Germans and brought them to do more to foster their nationality in order to preserve their identity and to keep from becoming Lettonian or Russian. Many German Societies have been organized. The one in Riga, of which I am a member, has over 10,000 members. Taking advantage of the more liberal laws this group has established new German schools, especially elementary ones. These were opened in September with an impressive service in the cathedral. It was an inspiring sight to see the spacious church full of German youth.[58]

This meant that the Lutheran Church was also experiencing better days in the Baltic. Significant is it that it was a different Lutheran Church as far as the Moravians were concerned, for instead of opposing the Brethren more and more pastors regarded them as allies. In fact the change in sentiment had already been noticed in the late years of the previous century when both Moravians and Lutherans were having a difficult time.[59] What drew the Brethren and the Lutherans closer together were of course their common German background and their minority status in Russia. But probably more important was the spirit of the times. The revolution brought a larger measure of freedom, but it also brought secularism and a spirit of industrial and social discontent. The common enemy of the churches was irreligion. The Brethren saw in the Lutherans the stability which they always

---

57. *Mittheilungen aus der Bruedergemeine*, 1906, Diaspora Reports, pp. 216ff, and 254ff.

58. *Mittheilungen aus der Bruedergemeine*, 1908, Diaspora Report for the year 1906-07, pp. 255-256.

59. A Diaspora report for the year 1892 shrewdly observes that the Lutheran friendliness was due to the fact that both parties were repressd, and that should there be a return of more freedom the old antipathy would probably arise again. *Kurze Mittheilungen*, 1892, p. 82.

preferred to the less stable free churches.[60] The Lutherans saw in the Moravians a means toward the revival of spiritual life in their parishes. At any rate, we find Lutheran pastors and superintendents inviting the Brethren to establish society work in their parishes.[61]

The Moravians were optimistic, but cautious. They did not increase the size of their staff or workers from Germany, leaving just three to superintend the field. These three at the outbreak of the war were stationed at Reval, Dorpat and Riga respectively. Each of these cities was the center of a circuit of about thirty prayer halls. This was the extent of the Moravian work in the Baltic in 1914.

Connections with the Moravian Church in Germany were broken off completely during the war, the three Diaspora workers leaving their stations. To a greater or lesser degree the religious life of the prayer halls was maintained by the local leaders. With the absence of the leadership of the mother church there was naturally a tendency to depart from the Moravian point of view. Generally the trend was in the direction of a free church. The state of affairs in the Baltic as far as the former Moravian societies is concerned was extremely uncertain and the Brethren in Germany had only a vague idea what the conditions really were. So it continued for some years after the war.

By 1920 the Brethren were able to report that it had been possible to establish relations with all of the Diaspora fields outside of Germany with the exception of those in the Baltic provinces.[62] Finally in 1925 a Diaspora agent, Gottfried Carlson, was sent from Sweden to make a contact visit. At this time the church felt that it was still out of the question to send someone to the field from Germany. Such occasional visits were made from Sweden for a period of several more years, until finally in 1931 Johannes Vogt of the church's governing board made an official

---

60. Increasingly in the communications of the Brethren to their headquarters there were references to Baptists, Methodists, and other free church groups, and an expressed dislike toward the rise of these groups in their Diaspora circuits.

61. *Mittheilungen aus der Bruedergemeine*, 1910, p. 147.

62. Th. Jensen, *Unser Diasporawerk*, 1920, p. 29.

tour of inspection, the prelude to a revival of Moravian connections with the project.[63]

At this point we must distinguish between the situation in Estonia and that in Latvia. Actually there is not too much to be said concerning the latter, for the Moravians never did get to reenter that field. One interesting development in Estonia shortly after the war was the establishment of a national Brethren's Church, independent of Herrnhut and recognized by the state. This was a free church and reflected the trend of national events in the country, for on January 1, 1926, church and state were separated. Those who comprised this national Brethren's Church naturally represented that element of the Diaspora which wished to move further away from Herrnhut. Others wished to revive the old connections.

At this juncture the Moravians in Germany were not yet ready to act. Though recognizing that the disestablishment of the church in Estonia confronted them with a new situation, they looked with disfavor upon the establishment of an independent Moravian Church in Estonia, largely because they felt that the group was too small.

The move to establish a national Brethren's Church seems to have lost its impetus after a few years and by about 1930 negotiations were under way for the reestablishment of connections with Herrnhut. This led to the official visit of Vogt, as previously mentioned. Vogt received a friendly reception and heard many of the society members express a desire for the resumption of connections with the Moravian Church. In fact, some of the societies, poor as the people were, were supporting two evangelists on the Moravian mission field in Nyasa, East Africa. The result of a conference with the local leaders was the following three-fold agreement:

> 1. That the Brethren who were leading the societies in Estonia regard the work there as a continuation of the old Herrnhut Diaspora work and are to send an annual report to Herrnhut.
>
> 2. The names of the chief leaders are to be sent to Herrnhut and prompt notification given of every change.
>
> 3. No real estate or house, which is registered in the name of the

63. *Mittheilungen aus der Bruedergemeine*, January-February, 1932, pp. 48ff.

Brethren's Unity is to be sold without previously consulting Herrnhut[64]

The first tangible result of this visit was the commissioning of two Diaspora workers for Estonia in 1932 in the person of Heinrich Bartels and Bruno Hans, the one a clergyman and the other a layman. These two, with headquarters in the city of Joesu, went about their duties for the seven years remaining before the outbreak of World War II. The extent of their field consisted of about ninety societies much smaller in size than the Brethren's societies had previously averaged, for the total membership of these was only about 3300 adults.[65] The prayer halls also seemed to be less in evidence and many of the services were in private homes. Among this small leaven under local lay leadership the Diaspora fellowship of the Moravians was being kept alive in quiet faithfulness when last we heard of it.

In adjoining Latvia there was likewise a feeble attempt at an independent Brethren's Church, recognized by the state in 1933.[66] The governing board of the Moravians in Germany was notified of the existence of this church and learned that its leaders were friendly toward Herrnhut. However, because of the political situation it still was not possible to send any German personnel to the field to assist the organization in getting on its feet. Apparently the anti-German feeling in Latvia was stronger than in Estonia, for in 1934 the Brethren in Latvia sought to establish affiliations with the world-wide Unity of the Brethren through the Moravians in the United States. Obviously the reason was that it was more strategic for them to negotiate with their fellow religionists in America than in Germany. In 1936 the state withdrew its recognition of the newly established Moravian Church in Latvia. The reason is not stated, but the German background of the church was probably the major factor.

Yet in the same year a representative of the Moravians from Germany, attended a synod of this small group in Latvia and while on his visit made a personal appeal to the government in

64. *Ibid.*, p. 54.
65. *Mittheilungen aus der Bruedergemeine*, 1939, p. 9.
66. *Mittheilungen aus der Bruedergemeine*, January-February, 1934, p. 12.

Riga to have recognition restored. His efforts were unsuccessful, and the last we hear of this tiny church of fourteen congregations is that it was having a struggle for existence.

Thus the Moravian Diaspora in the Baltic ended after two centuries of existence. What has happened in the last decade no one outside of these countries knows. The repatriation of thousands of German nationals in the pre-war German-Soviet trade must have been only the beginning of trouble. Yet the type of religious life represented by the Diaspora is the very kind that survives repression. No doubt behind the iron curtain the meeting of awakened Christians once in fellowship with Moravians in other lands are continuing in the regions bordering the Baltic Sea.[67]

---

67. For a summary of what happened to the churches in the Baltic lands up to 1946 see Leiper, *Christianity Today*, pp. 222-229. All the evidence points to a chaotic situation, but at the same time to the existence of vital spiritual life among many of the refugees. No mention is made of the Moravians. However, it must be remembered that most of the Diaspora Moravians would be classed as Lutherans.

CHAPTER VII

The Diaspora in Sweden

Like the Diaspora in Baltic Russia, that in Sweden merits a chapter in itself. Moravian influence in Sweden during the latter part of the eighteenth and the early part of the nineteenth centuries was, perhaps, proportionately greater than in any other country. Yet the number of Diaspora workers remained very small, averaging only four or five during the most flourishing period. Furthermore, in the two and a quarter centuries that the Moravians have been in Sweden, there has never been an organized congregation there. For these reasons Moravian records themselves do not fully reveal the extent of the work. But it is this situation which makes the presence of the Brethren in Sweden a fine example of Diaspora work in the Zinzendorfian sense. In permeating the life of the Swedish church without having an independent organization of their own in the country, the Moravians accomplished what was the original plan of the Count's congregation of God in the Spirit.

Moravianism in Sweden, as in Germany, was one of the forms of Pietism coming out of a background of orthodox Lutheranism. In the half century following the Thirty Years War, the Swedish church experienced the complete triumph of orthodoxy at the expense of the subjective element in religion, so conspicuous in early Lutheranism. The Pietiest[1] awakening reached Sweden during the latter years of Charles XI (1660-1697) and, in its first phase, continued in the ascendant during the first quarter of the eighteenth century. A great stimulus to the movement came with the return from Siberia in 1721 of Swedish prisoners of war. These men had come under its strong influence during their imprisonment.

This early Pietism in Sweden was of the conservative Halle type and attracted the support of some leading ecclesiastics. Among them were Jesper Swedberg, Bishop of Skara, Eric Benzelius the younger, Bishop of Linkoping and Archbishop; An-

1. Hjalmar Holmquist in *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, New York, 1911, XI, pp. 174-183, gives a good introductory review of Swedish Pietism.

dreas Rydelius, philosopher and Bishop of Lund; Peter Murback of Skone, known as the Francke of Sweden; Eric Tolstadius, vicar and pastor of the Skeppsholm Church in Stockholm; Sven Rosen, first a leader of the radical Pietists, but later one of the Brethren.

Yet the temper of the time in Sweden was strongly against anything which might threaten the unity of an autocratic centralized state. Pietists were looked upon with suspicion, as evidenced by a succession of edicts against conventicles, namely, in 1706, 1713, 1721 and 1726. The last of these, forbidding all public gatherings for worship except under the parish pastor, was not repealed until 1858. One result of these restrictions was to stimulate radical types of Pietism which had their rise in the seventeen-twenties and which were especially active in the following decade. Dippel's visit in 1729 made a great stir. Though Dippel himself was banished from the country, his followers grew in numbers to such an extent that the complaint arose that "scarcely one house in ten was free of Dippel's teching."[2] The awakening manifested itself in the form of revelations, speaking in tongues, prophesies of the latter days, etc. Roman Catholic mysticism, too, attracted great attention. These events evoked another repressive edict in 1735.

At the same time other forces were working in the direction of religious and other freedoms. The growth of industry and trade brought into the country foreign workers and business men of whom many were not of the Lutheran faith. For them concessions had to be made. There was also the influence of the Enlightenment during the second half of the century. Despite the die-hard efforts of the conservatives to the contrary, the eighteenth century was one of increasing liberalism for Sweden.

Moravian contacts in Sweden were made at an early period of

---

2. S. Groendahl, "Die Bruedergemeine in Schweden von 1727 bis 1744," in the *Herrnhut*, no. 5, 1910, p. 34. This account of the beginning of the Moravian Church's work in Sweden is based upon Nils Jacobsson's *Den Svenska Herrnhutismens Uppkomst*, Uppsala, 1908.

the Renewed Church.[3] At the time of the organization of Herrnhut in the summer of 1727, the Swedish assessor, Carl Henric Grundelstierna, already a follower of Tolstadius in Stockholm, was there on a student tour. Deeply impressed, he learned all he could about the Brethren, and, upon his return to Sweden in 1729, was an enthusiastic spokesman for them. He carried on an active correspondence with Zinzendorf in his efforts to facilitate the coming of the Moravians to Sweden. Even before Grundelstierna's return, plans were launched to carry the message of Herrnhut to Sweden. Grundelstierna spent several weeks in Freiberg in the spring of 1728 teaching Swedish to Melchior Zeisberger and Christian David in preparation for their going to Grundelstierna's native land as itinerant workmen. Later these two spent a few months in Stockholm, as did Zinzendorf's own secretary, Tobias Friederich. These men were the first of the Diaspora workers who began to visit Sweden with regularity after 1751.[4] The fellowship between the pre-Moravian Swedish Pietists and the Moravians is revealed in the experience of Andrew Grasmann, Daniel Schneider and John Nitschmann in 1734. In that year they spent five months in Stockholm preparatory to a projected mission among the Lapps, during which time they were warmly welcomed by Tolstadius. Though dissuaded from the mission project, these Brethren helped lay the foundations for the Swedish Diaspora.

Zinzendorf himself made a brief visit to southern Sweden in May of 1735 on his return to Germany from Denmark. At Malmo, he met, among others, Peter Murbeck, who had gathered a handful of earnest Pietists. Later he called on one of the city's pastors, at whose suggestion he went to Lund to confer with Bishop Rydelius. The two found themselves warmly drawn to each other by the similarity of their religious positions. However, the major portion of the Count's stay in Sweden was at Ystadt where

3. John Amos Comenius, 1592-1670, one of the later bishops of the Ancient Unitas Fratrum, spent four years, 1642-1646, in helping to reform the educational system of Sweden. This contact of Comenius, however, had no connection with the activity of the Renewed Moravian Church in Sweden a century later. For details of this phase of the work of Comenius see Matthew Spinka's *John Amos Comenius*, Chicago, 1943, pp. 90-120.

4. S. Groendahl, "Die Bruedergemein in Schweden von 1727 bis 1744," in the *Herrnhut*, no. 5, 1910, p. 35.

he was detained by contrary winds. Here he spent his time in study and letter writing.

The brief visit did have a rather significant consequence, for two weeks after his departure from Malmo a rescript was issued from Stockholm to forestall his ever settling in Sweden. The contents intimated that Zinzendorf had been theologically examined in Copenhagen and convinced of his errors, that he had been requested to remove from Danish territories, that he was banned from Saxony, and that he had sought a place in Sweden.[5]

In reply to this attack, the Count resolved to write a letter in his own name and that of the Moravian Church to the king of Sweden, in which he would explain the position of the Brethren. Emphasis was to be upon adherence of the Moravians to the Augsburg Confession. The letter was printed and sent not only to the Swedish king, but also to religious and civic officials of a number of countries. Among Zinzendorf's writings this letter[6] is one of the important documents setting forth the Count's theological position.

Moravian contacts in Sweden prior to the late seventeen-thirties were only preliminary. The real impact of Herrnhut influence first came between 1739 and 1742 and centers around three key personalities: Thore Odhelius, Stockholm pastor; Elias Ostergren, Diaspora worker; and Arvid Gradin, envoy extraordinary for the Brethren. Pleijel refers to these men as the "three pioneers."[7]

Odhelius as a young man had been a follower of conservative Pietism in Stockholm in the middle of the seventeen-twenties, but some years later had strong leanings toward the more extreme form as propounded by Dippel. Ordained in 1734, he became a pastor in royal circles. In 1738 he was appointed assistant rector of the great city school in Stockholm. Shortly after, on a visit to Livonia[8] in company with the noble family of

---

5. Spangenberg, p. 192.
6. It is to be found in the *Buedingische Samlungen*, I, No. 13.
7. Hilding Pleijel, *Svenska Kyrkans Historia*, V, p. 421.
8. It will be noted that other key personalities in Sweden were first introduced to Moravianism in the Baltic states. This is understandable in view of the fact that many Swedish noble families had established themselves in these countries during the time when they were under Swedish rule.

Stromfelt, he found himself in the middle of the awakening which accompanied the beginning of Moravian work in that country. Although opposed at first, he was soon won over to the Brethren, and, full of his new experience, he returned to Stockholm in 1739 and started immediately to "speak of the strength of the Atonement and the glory of the crucified Saviour."[9] In a letter to a fellow Herrnhuter a year or two later he tells of his change from radical Pietism to that of Herrnhut, which he calls a "peaceful" religion. He felt that the Moravians had recovered the Christocentric faith of Luther. The Stromfelt family[10] also became prominent in the Diaspora group in the capital.

The awakened preacher had an immediate response among the people of the capital. His preaching attracted great crowds, both in church and in the Old Ladies Home on Hamm Street, one of the meeting places for the Pietists. Most of the followers of Odhelius were formerly radicals who in their demoralized and confused state welcomed the message of Herrnhut as the salvation of heart religion.

Significant for the future of the Diaspora in Sweden was the conversion of considerable numbers of pastors whose parishes became centers for the work. Among such was Jonas Hellman who, like Odhelius himself, found the ways of the Brethren an escape from radical Pietism. An important factor in his experience was the reading of Zinzendorf's *Berlinischer Reden*, which in the ensuing years were to have great influence in the country. Even more important to the Moravian cause were Eric Giers and Olaf Lind, assistants of Tolstadius at the Skeppsholm Church. Tolstadius himself, though one who had earlier helped to bring Pietism to Sweden, at this stage remained aloof from the Moravians. Compared to Lind, Giers was the more popular preacher. A pre-Moravian Pietist, he transferred his enthusiasm from the earlier Pietism to that of Herrnhut. His written sermons continued to be widely read well into the nineteenth century.

---

9. Pleijel, *Svenska Kyrkans Historia*, V, p. 422.

10. In a letter from the Diaspora worker in Stockholm to the church in Germany written in June of 1746 we read: "The four countesses of Stromfelt salute you most tenderly. Their fifth sister is also become a reward of our Saviour." From "Extracts of some accounts taken out of some letters from Sweedland, 1746." MS in Moravian Archives.

Lind in a more quiet, yet very effective way, was a champion of the Brethren in the capitol until his appointment as pastor in Soderhamn in 1757. In the latter place he maintained his active connection with them. Within a few years the church life of Stockholm was feeling strongly the influence of Herrnhut.

Parallel with the awakening in the capital was that in western Sweden, in Vastergotland and Goteborg, under the leadership of the shoemaker Elias Ostergren.[11] Born in Stockholm, the son of a soldier, Ostergren as an apprentice learned the shoemaker's trade. Then as an itinerant cobbler he came in contact with a variety of religious groups without finding inner peace for himself. Hearing of Zinzendorf, he went to Herrnhut early in 1739, and there the thirty-three year old cobbler underwent a transforming experience. Shortly thereafter he was back in Sweden with a fellow craftsman, Olaf Bjorn, to embark upon a program of itinerant evangelism typical of the early Moravian Diaspora worker. Pleijel says of Ostergren: "The thirty-three year old shoemaker whose hand worked with the awl better than with the pencil seemed to have understood how to win an unlimited confidence wherever he went."[12]

Like Odhelius in the capital, Ostergren was conspicuously successful in winning over and bringing order into the ranks of the Pietists. In Goteborg he brought peace to the group under the pastor Andreas Hillestrom. A few months later he accomplished the same thing with a similar group in Frammestad, whose leader was the preacher Andres Tengbom. The story was repeated in Uddevalla, Vanersborg and Stora Bjurum. Among those who attached themselves to the Brethren in the last named place was the Countess Stenbock. Ostergren's itinerations in western Sweden were the beginning of a notable change in the religious life of that part of the country. In his footsteps soon followed other workers under whom the Diaspora fellowship was quietly but effectively maintained.

---

11. Ostergren's "Lebenslauf," an autographical account of his religious pilgrimage, appears in *Gemein Nachtrichten*, II, 1825, pp. 298ff.
12. *Svenska Kyrkans Historia*, p. 428.

The third pioneer, Arvid Gradin,[13] comes into prominence in Swedish Moravian circles as one of a two-man delegation from headquarters in Marienborn, Germany, to smooth the way for the Brethren in the face of certain difficulties. The successes in Stockholm and elsewhere had aroused opposition. Added to the polemical literature against Zinzendorf and his followers were threats of restrictive legal action. The Moravian synod commissioned Martin Dober, head of the Unity's Elders' Conference, and Gradin to see what could be done. Gradin's part turned out to be a year of fruitful Diaspora evangelism in Sweden.

The son of a pastor from Dalarne, he had been under Pietist influence since childhood, having had Andreas Hillestrom as a tutor. As a student at Uppsala he was among those who used to go down to the capital city to hear the preaching of Tolstadius. In 1730 he went to Stockholm as a tutor and, there, more and more felt the pressure of Pietist influence. In 1736 he became a docent in Uppsala. He found no voice which satisfied him until he learned of the Brethren from a book about Herrnhut by Christian David, which he ran across in a bookshop. He became so interested that he went to Herrnhut in 1738 and there soon found religious assurance. Becoming a full-fledged member of the Brotherhood, he was destined to serve in important assignments the rest of his life, the first one being a visit to the head of the Greek Church in Constantinople. His trip with Dober to Sweden was his second important commission.

Armed with an official script in Latin descriptive of the Brethren's Church, together with a brief history of the church, Dober and Gradin as their first success won the friendship of Bishop Johannes Steuchius in Uppsala. Gradin's former associations there, particularly with the two professors Matthias Asp and Andreas Winbom, helped to pave the way for them.

In the capital itself Gradin's visit was like a triumphal tour.[14] He was graciously received by Eric Alstrin, primary pastor of the Great Church. His old principal, Friherr Cederstrom, now chan-

---

13. Gradin's "Lebenslauf" appears in the *Gemein Nachtrichten*, I, 1823, pp. 224ff.
14. Pleijel, *Svenska Kyrkans Historia*, p. 433.

cellor of Abo University (in Finland) offered him a professorship. Though not a Swedish pastor, Gradin was invited to preach in the Great Church. In his audience were about twenty pastors, who after hearing him extol the merits of the crucified Savior, agreed that he was a true evangelist. Count Carl Gyllenborg, council president, had him preach in his private chapel. Like Dippel, fourteen years earlier, Gradin became a familiar figure in the streets of Stockholm. Odhelius himself, who had done so much to advance the cause of the Brethren, was deeply touched and became even more an advocate of Herrnhutism than before. An important accession was the teacher Johan Christopher Holmberg, whose literary works were later of invaluable aid to the Moravians in Sweden.

From Stockholm Gradin went to the outlying districts, mostly in the territory so successfully evangelized by Ostergren. The work in Goteborg and Vastergotland took on new life, gaining both new adherents and consolidating itself in better organization. Not only did Gradin win new adherents, but he went on to organize them where possible into choirs, on the basis of age, sex and marital status, in Herrnhut fashion. The secret of much of his success was that he was able to win key individuals in the communities he visited: pastors, teachers, nobility, civic officials.

Gradin returned to Marienborn in the summer of 1742 and could look back upon the past year with deep satisfaction. The work which had been established by Odhelius and Ostergren had been strengthened and extended through his efforts. The Moravians at this stage had two main centers of activity, Stockholm and Frammestad. As already suggested, their outstanding contribution during these years was to restore the morale of the earlier Swedish Pietism. Holmquist says of the coming of the Brethren: "The movement was wholesome, bringing back the enthusiasts and stimulating orthodoxy with life."[15] Many separatists were brought back into the state church in line with Moravian insistence upon loyalty to the establishment.

The next few years continued to be encouraging. Under Odhelius' able leadership the groups in Stockholm and en-

15. *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, XI, p. 181.

virons flourished. The central figure in the Frammestad area in the West was Tengbom. Among the prominent accessions during this early period was the above-mentioned Sven Rosen, who joined the Moravians at Marienborn in December of 1743. Though hoping to do so, Rosen never returned to Sweden, dying in the service of the Moravians in Pennsylvania in 1750, at the early age of forty-two.[16]

In this same period the eminent Emanuel Swedenborg, under Pietist influence from childhood, was in active fellowship with the Moravians in England. In the year 1744 his work took him to London where he attended the Moravian Chapel in Fetter Lane. Shortly before, Swedenborg had met a pious itinerant Moravian shoemaker on a packet-boat from Holland to England, and following his practice of taking lodging[17] with artisans, lived with this man for a time in London. Later he lived with members of the Fetter Lane group. The great religious change in the life of the fifty-six year old man of science was still in its incipient stages. In his diary for the year he writes concerning the Moravians as follows:

> By various circumstances I was led into the church belonging to the Moravian Brethren, who maintain that they are the true Lutherans, and that they feel the influx of the Holy Spirit, as they tell each other; further that they have respect only to God's grace, to Christ's blood and merit, and that they go about in simplicity. On this subject I shall speak more fully some other time; for as yet I am not allowed to join their brotherhood. . . . I am with them and yet not accepted by them.[18]

Doubtless what kept Swedenborg out of the membership of the Moravian Church, as it did many others, was the use of the lot in admitting members. Later he became very critical of the Moravians, especially for what he considered their doctrinal errors, and for their exclusiveness and lack of charity. He was one of a number in the Swedish colony in London who came under the influence of the Brethren. Among them were Olof Bjorn and

---

16. Pleijel, *Svenska Kyrkans Historia*, p. 444.
17. Signe Toksvig, Emanuel Swedenborg, Yale University Press, 1948, pp. 144-145.
18. Cited by Marguerite Beck Block in *The New Church in the New World*, New York, 1932, p. 10.

Magnus Sten, [19] who appear later as Diaspora workers in their native land.

It is hard to understand at first glance how this extensive activity was carried on with only three to five Diaspora agents. The explanation lies in the contacts through travel, correspondence, and literature between Moravian centers in Germany and the awakened in Sweden. Groendahl describes this as follows:

> The Brethren's fellowship became more and more important to them. Yes, many traveled to Herrnhut, Marienborn, Herrnhag, in order to participate completely in the meetings there. Students, pastors, and especially craftsmen are to be seen traveling southward and there to spend a few years among the Brethren. Through this there arose an extensive exchange of letters and circulars in Swedish groups. . . . When such visitors returned home they usually became leaders of the Brethren's circles in Sweden.[20]

Not to be overlooked as a point of contact for the Brethren in Sweden is the considerable number of Germans who had been attracted there as skilled workmen and tradesmen, to whom the German literature was readily accessible. But also among the better educated Swedes themselves were many who read German. These read Zinzendorf's speeches and writings. Especially influential were his *Berlinischer Reden*. For the rank and file who could not read the devotional German literature Swedish translations were soon forthcoming. Prominent in this phase of the work was John Holmberg, who at this time had published a volume of the writings of David Hollotz, a Pomeranian Lutheran pastor who had come under Moravian influence. Already distributed to the extent of 18,000 copies in the seventeen-forties, this manual under the title *Order of Grace* appeared in various editions until as late as 1870. The nature of the book can be surmised from the fact that it was responsible for the turning point in the religious life of the philosophic thinker Anders Knos.

Alongside of the *Order of Grace* was the collection of hymns under the title *Zions Songs* issued in the spring of 1743, also through the efforts of Holmberg. The first edition, a book of ninety hymns, was followed two years later by another collection

19. Groendahl, "*Die* Bruedergemeine in Schweden, 1727-1744," in the Herrnhut, 1910, no. 6, p. 51.
20. *Ibid.*, no. 10, p. 75.

of 130 numbers. Subsequently these were combined into a song book which in the course of time went through twenty editions, remaining in use almost to the present era. Gjorwell has said that the *Order of Grace* and *Zions Songs* alone changed many thousand souls in the country without those affected ever knowing about Herrnhut.[21]

Most of the authors of these hymns were pioneers for Herrnhutism in Sweden. Among them were Holmberg himself, James Hellman, Olof Kolmodin, Gradin, the Diaspora workers Erland Becklind and Peter Werving, the sisters Stromfelt and the young pastor, Lars Nyberg.[22] These Pietist hymns, Christo-centric, introspective, full of feeling, were emotionally satisfying, and more eagerly sung than the heavier church hymns. Religious revival and song were closely united in *Zions Songs.*

Making its appearance in Sweden also in the seventeen-forties was the devotional manual *Daily Texts.*[23] With its simple format of Bible and hymn verses for daily use, this too met the needs of those whose emphasis was upon experiential religion.

For two or three years following the successes of Odhelius, Ostergren and Gradin, Moravianism continued to grow. This in itself was cause for concern on the part of the authorities, ever suspicious of any sort of demonstrative religious awakening. But about the middle of the decade an unfortunate development within the circles of the Brethren gave a real reason for hostility. This development was the well-known "Sifting Period," which reached its height between 1745-1750. Centered in the Wetteravian settlements of Marienborn and Herrnhag, and by some referred to as "Wetteravianism," it spread throughout the entire church in greater or lesser degree. In Diaspora circles Sweden seems to have been affected more than those in Germany itself, and the excesses of this time of sentimentality almost spelled the doom of Moravianism in the Scandinavian land.[24] A letter from

---

21. Cited by Pleijel in *Svenska Kyrkans Historia*, p. 446.
22. Nyberg was another Swedish Moravian who later evangelised for the Brethren in America.
23. For a detailed account of the Daily Texts see Chapter V, pp. 74-77.
24. Hermann C. Schneider in a review of Nils Jacobsson's *Den Svenska Herrnhutismens Uppkomta*, in *Zeitschrift fuer Bruedergeschichte*, 1907-1908, pp. 238-248.

the Brethren in Germany to Sweden in the summer of 1743 was a forerunner of what was ahead. The Swedes were told to be "more simple and childlike and by 'swimming in blood' become 'blessed and cheerful'."[25] They replied that they had not yet gotten to experience such feeling, but expressed a wish to reach that stage. About this time Zinzendorf organized the "Order of Fools," supposedly in protest against the wisdom of this world. The members were expected to behave like children, since God had revealed himself "not to the wise and prudent, but to babes." Therefore the more childish they acted, the more they would attain spiritual wisdom. Those affected used diminutives for many things. The Count was referred to as "Papa" or "Little Papa." They spoke of Christ as "Brother Lambkin."

Especially repulsive was the emphasis upon the physical sufferings of Christ, with nauseating, detailed references to his blood and wounds. The Brethren and Sisters spoke of themselves as "little doves flying about in the atmosphere of the cross," and as "little fish swimming in the bed of blood," or as "little bees who suck on the wounds of Christ, who feel at home in the Side-Hole and crawl in deep." Again they would call themselves "bloodthirsty beasts," "blood leeches," "wound worms" and "Side-Hole hearts."[26]

This unfortunate episode was inflicted upon the Swedish Brethren to a greater degree than might have been otherwise the case because the two most active Diaspora workers, Peter Werving and Erland Becklind, were carried away by it. Werving, a native of Uppsala, had experienced a religious awakening in Livonia, where he first came to know the Brethren. Shortly thereafter he went to Marienborn to join the church. In subsequent assignments in church service he was closely associated with the Count's son, Christian Renatus, who was one of those responsible for the excesses of the sifting period. Saturated with the sentimental point of view, Werving, with his wife, came as a Diaspora worker to Stockholm in 1745.

Becklind as a student had been attracted to Pietism in Up-

---

26. See Hutton, pp. 274-282.
25. Pleijel, *Svenska Kyrkans Historia*, p. 452.

psala already in 1721, but like Werving found his religious home among the Brethren after becoming acquainted with them in Reval. In 1741 he joined the church at Marienborn, after which he intinerated for the Brethren, at length being sent to Stockholm in 1743. He was having a successful Diaspora ministry when Werving came to replace him in 1745. From Stockholm Becklind was transferred to Frammestad. Thus the two important Moravian centers in Sweden had leaders who were of the "Wetteravian" point of view.

The outlook is revealed in a letter addressed to the church in Germany in April of 1747:

> Here in Sweden the Lamb is making himself very evident among us, and our number increases daily. It does not yet proceed entirely like the Cross-Air little birds, yet it is beginning to be more established, and we have several gracious little hearts with whom we have many happy and blessed hours together.[28]

Adding to the confusion was a visit in 1746 by Rosina Nitschmann, [28] wife of Bishop David Nitschmann, who with a company of Diaspora workers was on her way to Livonia. Werving reports to "Papa" of the "so very blessed and jolly time" in mother Rosina's company."[29]

The hymnology of the period conspicuously reflected the religiously morbid state of mind of the Brethren. When Zinzendorf's *Twelfth Supplement* to the hymnal appeared in 1748, the already widespread ridicule directed against the Moravians increased to flood proportions.

Fortunately, in the midst of this sad state of affairs, sensible voices began to assert themselves. In the capital it was the veteran Thore Odhelius who tried to check the trend. In the Frammestad area it was the pastor-evangelists Christian Lenberg and Peter Arvidsson. Some in disgust left the ranks of the Brethren. Others, like Odhelius,[30] remained loyal and helped to bring an end to the excesses.

---

27. Pleijel *Das Kirchenproblem der Bruedergemeine in Schweden*, p. 24.
28. In a letter written from Stockholm she writes: "I am a very poor sinner, but a happy little worm which lives with great pleasure in the Side-Hole," from Extracts of some accounts taken out of some letters from Sweedland, 1746," MS in Moravian Archives.
29. Pleijel, *Svenska Kyrkans Historia*, p. 456.
30. As indicated later, Odhelius eventually did become estranged from the Brethren.

Summarizing the thinking of the protesting group is a letter[31] of Odhelius addressed to Zinzendorf in January of 1749, in which the Swedish pastor acknowledges the great blessing which the Moravians had brought to Sweden, that not only great numbers of the rank and file had been spiritually awakened, but that in Stockholm alone there were over seventy spiritual leaders openly teaching according to the views of the Brethren. But unhappily, according to Odhelius, since about 1745, Herrnhut literature and songs, especially the *Twelfth Supplement* of hymns of 1748, was the object of shame and ridicule. He calls attention to the aberrations in terminology concerning the Godhead, the puerile expressions, etc. Finally, he asks the Count to renounce these things in an open declaration. The answer was not long in coming. At the time of Odhelius' letter the Count and others responsible for the situation were already beginning to return to their senses. He addressed the entire church in a circular letter; he visited various congregations and urged them to repent; he suppressed the *Twelfth Appendix* and deleted offensive passages in his own discourses, and issued treatises in defense of the Brethren.[32] To the folks in Sweden in particular he wrote a letter in which he expressed his displeasure of the methods of Werving, and asked that the offensive literature of the period be not regarded as the expression of the true spiritual life of the Brethren. He held up to them the example of the group at Herrnhut, which had declared its allegiance to the Scriptures and to the Augsburg Confession.[33]

The reply satisfied Odhelius, and all might have been peaceful within the circles of the Brethren had it not been for the influence of the popular preacher, Anders Carl Rutstrom, of whom there is more to be said later. In the meantime, Pietism and Moravianism in particular received a blow from the side of the state. While the Moravians were going through the sifting time there was a change of climate in state church circles. The second half of the seventeen-forties saw a rising tide of orthodoxy, encouraged in no small

---

31. This letter is printed in the appendix of Pleijel's *Das Kirchenproblem der Bruedergemeine in Schweden*, pp. 155-163.
32. Hutton, p. 281.
33. Pleijel, *Das Kirchenproblem der Bruedergemeine in Schweden*, p. 25.

part by the irresponsible behavior of many Pietists. At the same time, there came to the head of the Church of Sweden, in 1747, a stern champion of orthodoxy in the person of Henric Benzelius, the youngest of the three brothers who successively occupied the post of archbishop.

In contrast to Eric, who had taken a sympathetic attitude toward the Pietists, and in comparison with Jacob, who was cool but not actively opposed, Henric took upon himself almost the zeal of a fanatic against innovations in religion. The behavior of the Herrnhuters at the time of his accession obviously lent support to his stand. The Archbishop spared no energy in trying to expose Herrnhutism as a grave danger to the church. At the Reichstag of 1747 he succeeded in securing a resolution asking the Provost, Eric Beckman, to prepare a pamphlet against the Moravians. Beckman accordingly translated the work of the German theologian E. S. Cyprian, published in 1744 and entitled *A Sensible Warning Against the Errors of Toleration in Religious Matters*, adding an introduction concerning the Herrnhut sect. The book was issued with an official foreword and distributed throughout the bishopries.

Still further, Benzelius sent a communication to the King in October of 1748, in which in a bitter tone he paints the "Herrnhut Creepers" in dark colors. He regards them as those who have in view the destruction of the church. He complains that already some of the Zinzendorf terminology was being used by state pastors. He asks for a general edict against the Moravians. Though this appeal did not immediately result in such an edict, it produced almost the equivalent, for two months later the Riksdag sent a message to the consistories, reminding them that the laws against conventicles still stood, especially those of 1735 which permitted legal action even in cases where there was only a suspicion of heretical religious behavior.

Earlier that year Arvid Gradin[34] had returned to Sweden. Filled with memories of his successes in 1741-1742, he was hopeful that he could improve the status of the Moravians in his native land. He was soon to be disillusioned. There were still demonstr-

34. As stated in the chapter on the Baltic States, Gradin was a prisoner in Russia from 1743-1747.

ations of enthusiasm for Gradin on the part of many, but it was the attitude of men in official key positions which mattered more. Even some of Gradin's old friends in university circles had turned against him and the Herrnhuters. To no avail he wrote a pamphlet in which he tried to prove the orthodoxy of the Moravians, as evidenced by their having gained approval by a Saxon commission in the same year, 1748, as adherents of the Augsburg Confession. He was investigated before the consistory in an examination that dragged on for months, at the end of which the Swedish churchmen refused to acknowledge the Brethren as members of the above Confession, pointing rather to some of Zinzendorf s writings as normative for the Herrnhuters. Gradin incurred the further opposition of the churchmen by his refusal to return to the Swedish state church. More polemical tracts against the Brethren were issued. Finally Gradin was expelled from the country early in 1750.

Werving, the Diaspora worker in Stockholm, was called before the consistory repeatedly, and though no formal legal action against him was ever taken, he felt so restricted that, when poor health further hampered him, he left Sweden of his own accord in 1751.

The climax of these critical years for the Moravians came when Benzelius persuaded the new king, Adolf Frederick, in May of 1751, to circularize the church officials with the order to be on guard "against infiltrating fanatics and heretics in general and expecially against the errors of the Herrnhuters in particular."[35] This action was precipitated especially because of what had happened in and around Stockholm, but the Brethren in all of Sweden were in Jeopardy, and at first glance it looked as if their work might soon come to an end. Actually such was far from the case, and Moravianism in Sweden proved the same capacity to survive official restrictions as it did in Russia and elsewhere.

A revealing survey of the work in 1750 is given in an official report Gradin prepared for a Moravian synod in September of that year.[36] Gradin's outlook naturally reflects the disappoint-

35. Pleijel, *Das Kirchenproblem der Bruedergemeine in Schweden*, P. 28.

36. "A. Gradin an die Bruedergemeine (v.j. 1750)," R. 19 F. a. HA, printed in the appendix, pp. 81-91, of Pleijel's *Das Kirchenproblem der Bruedergemeine in Schweden.*

ment which he had experienced in Sweden the previous year, but it is by no means that of a defeatist. After acknowledging the difficulties, he makes this three-fold observation:

> 1. That there are many awakened pastors who bear witness of the Saviour and His blood atonement;
>
> 2. That these witnesses are so scattered throughout the land that there is hardly any locality in the country where there are not several, or at least one or two of them;
>
> 3. That through their witness many awakenings are happening in the land.[37]

More specifically he relates that upon his arrival in Sweden in 1748 he was able to account for some eighty pastors instead of the expected forty who were working for the Brethren. For his own personal security reasons, upon leaving Sweden he had not taken with him a catalog list of such leaders, but he appends to his synodal report a list, reconstructed from memory, of seventy-two names of ministers from all over Sweden. Twelve of these were in Stockholm alone and fifteen in the Vastergotland area. In all, fourteen districts are listed comprising dozens of cities and towns. Gradin estimates the number of awakened in Stockholm at 300, of which he says that 200 are under the close supervision of the Brethren. The interesting thing is that there were only five Diaspora workers in all of Sweden at the time, the Werving couple in Stockholm and the three itinerant Brethren Langberg, Mall and Ostergren.[38] The Swedish Brethren were truly a scattered fellowship, with a remarkable sense of belonging to a group, thanks to Herrnhut literature, songs and correspondence.

Evidence of the ties with the Brethren's Unity as a whole is the mention in the report of various families asking for permission to send their children to the church's schools in Germany, and of the desire of Swedish Diaspora Brethren here and there to leave their homes and take up their residence in one of the settlement congregations, either at Herrnhut or at Zeist. We learn from the report, too, that several Swedish Brethren were in the service of the Moravians in other lands, a situation which has continued to be the case through the years.

37. *Ibid.*, p. 81.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 87.

Moravianism in Sweden was difficult to get rid of in these early years because it was an influence rather than an organized movement, a point of view which legislation could not change. Many of the Brethren's key men were Lutheran pastors in good standing. In their parishes the Diaspora groups were among their most faithful members and good citizens in general. As long as these members were loyal to the church, the policing of their more private religious lives was not an easy task on the part of their opposers. It is not surprising, therefore, that within a few years the Moravians should increase rather than decrease.

Already making a good recovery by 1760, the Brethren were at the height of their influence in Sweden about a generation later. The lack of vitality in the state church during the time of Rationalism commonly referred to in Sweden as Neology, had the same effect as in Germany, namely, to drive many into such extra-church groups as the Moravians. As stated previously, the two early main centers of Moravian influence were Stockholm and the region around Vastergotland and Goteborg. In the seventeen-fifties a new center of influence developed around Allerum, just outside of Halsingborg, thanks to the work of John Nicholas Sundius, head pastor in Allerum from 1730 to his death in 1774. Of a mystical, introspective bent, Sundius as a student was deeply influenced by Rydelius at Lund. Illness early in his pastorate accentuated his concern for inwardness in religion. It was natural that such a disposition as his should feel friendship and sympathy with the message of the Herrnhuters. Like so many others, he was deeply impressed with Zinzendorf's *Berlinischer Reden* which fell into his hands in 1747. From then on he was an enthusiastic reader of Moravian literature, referring to their *Gemein Nachtrichten* as a modern version of the Acts of the Apostles.[39] After visiting Sundius in 1750, Gradin referred to him as "one of our most important pastor brothers in Sweden."[40] His home became the center of Diaspora meetings. During his long pastorate at Allerum he was a spiritual father for a succession of young assistants and through them, he left his stamp upon the piety of

39. "Schreiben von J. Sundius, August 24, 1767," in the appendix to Pleijel's *Das Kirchenproblem der Bruedergemeine in Schweden*, pp. 163-164.
40. Pleijel, *Svenska Kyrkans Historia*, p. 469.

southern Sweden for a long time.

Concurrent with the beginning of Sundius' espousal of Moravianism were the itinerations of the teacher from Daviken, Magnus Hagestrom, who already in 1748 had begun contacting groups of people sympathetic to the Brethren in Lund, Malmo, Landskrona and Halsingborg. The resulting awakening in these localities, together with those under Sundius, attracted the strenuous opposition of the new archbishop, Benzelius, at that time still living in Lund. However, nothing serious came of the opposition, and, in the course of the next two decades, the Moravian form of piety flourished in many pulpits and in many homes in this southwestern corner of Sweden.

The revival in the seaport city of Karlskrona was under the leadership of a blacksmith's wife, Christina Ecklund, who, a few years before on a visit to Stockholm, had been spiritually awakened by the preacher Eric Giers. Composed of humble folks, without any persons of distinction,[41] the Karlskrona group was especially dependent upon Herrnhut literature. The source of the life of this group were the previously mentioned *Order of Grace* and *Zions Songs*. Pleijel says that the Karlskrona folks are an excellent illustration of Gjorwall's statement that the Herrnhuters, thanks to their literature, won thousands of followers who never were aware of Herrnhut.[42]

Still, in southern Sweden, we note that in the middle of the seventeen-sixties the center of influence shifted a few European miles eastward to Riseberger, in Norra Asbo province. The leader of the revival there was the forty-year old pastor Samuel Arsenius, who, Pleijel says, ranked after Sundius as the one contributing the most to the cause of the Brethren in this part of Sweden. Pleijel's statement of Moravian work in southern Sweden in this period is as follows:

> By the end of the seventeen-sixties Herrnhutism had won a firm foothold in south Sweden. It counted its members from Bastad in the north to Nalmo in the south, and from Halsingborg in the west

41. The one exception was the thirty-year old master, Samuel Lemchen, who later became a professor of theology in Lund. See Pleijel, *Svenska Kyrkans Historia*, p. 474.

42. *Ibid.*, p. 473.

> to Stoby in the east. It had spread slowly from pastor to pastor, from parish to parish. How great the number was is impossible to determine. It was not so overwhelming if one reckson only with those who were in direct contact with the Diaspora workers and Herrnhut. But one must take into consideration that besides this Herrnhut standing-army there were large bands who were seized by Herrnhut piety without knowing of either Zinzendorf or Herrnhut. They were well versed in the Herrnhut-colored books of edification, and they listed preferably to those pastors who were known for their "evangelical presentation." In contrast to conservative pietism, which was recruited mostly from the noble and burgher classes, Herrnhutism reached out to the broad strata of the people and thus made a democratic impact on the times, with the possibility of bridging over many chasms between the diverse social strata.[43]

In older Moravian territory in western Sweden the work also took an upward swing, spreading northward to Uddevalla, which eventually came to be another important center of the work alongside of that in Goteborg. Great gains were also registered in this region in the rural sections. On the negative side is to be noted that two old friends of the Moravians had become estranged, namely, Anders Tengbom and Thore Odhelius. Tengbom's home at Frammestad had been a center of Diaspora work until the middle of the seventeen-fifties. About this time Odhelius moved from Stockholm to the parish at Flo, becoming a neighbor of Tengbom. The same Odhelius who had tried so hard to restore sanity to the Moravians in Stockholm had eventually become estranged. In his new parish his influence upon Tengbom was such that both pastors were cool to the Moravians. They received the Diaspora workers into their parishes, allowing them to speak to individuals, but would not permit meetings. Tengbom died in 1774 and Odhelius in 1777, both to the end remaining aloof from the cause they had once so ardently championed.

Growth in the Stockholm area was retarded by the dissensions centering around Rutstrom, referred to earlier. Coming to Stockholm in 1745 as vice-minister at the Great Church, he soon had contact with Eric Giers, who introduced him to the Herrnhuters. By 1748 he had become an enthusiastic advocate of the Brethren. The current "blood and wounds" theology captured his fertile

43. Pleijel, *Svenska Kyrkans Historia*, p. 478.

imagination. With his ability to speak in popular, even vulgar style, to paint drastic pictures, to express deep pathos, Rutstrom soon had a large following. But he also offended conservative Pietists, the orthodox Lutherans, and many of the Herrnhuters themselves.

The result was a schism in the ranks of the Brethren, one group following the Diaspora worker Werving, the other Rutstrom. Among other things, Rutstrom sought to sever the Swedish Brethren from their Herrnhut connection and to put himself at the head of the Moravians in Sweden. Upon Werving's departure in 1751, the Herrnhuters were left in a demoralized state and remained so during most of the decade. Unfortunately it was Rutstrom's following, not the more conservative group, which was regarded by the public as the expression of Herrnhutism in Stockholm.[44] With controversy continually surrounding the man, the course of the Brethren was anything but smooth.

Rutstrom was suspended by his consistory in 1750-1751, and again in 1754-1755. But, by throwing himself into politics on the side of the "Hat" party, he was soon back in favor and, in 1758, secured an even better pastoral appointment than before in Stockholm. In 1765 the "Hats" lost their power to the "Caps," and Rutstrom was not only deposed, but also banished. Another shift in the political scene enabled him to return by 1770, but he did not receive another appointment. Following the revolution of 1772, he was imprisoned, because the ruling party feared his influence among the people. A few days following his arrest he died in prison.

Rutstrom's influence continued through his poetry and songs. Already in 1756 there had appeared an anonymous collection of religious poems under the title *Special Songs About Jesus Christ's Birth.* The authors were Rutstrom and two other Herrnhuters. Soon after his death there was published a book called *Rutstrom's Songs.* Then, in 1788, there was published in Copenhagen *Zions New Songs of the Deceased Anders Carl Rutstrom During His Preaching Years.* Of the 157 numbers not less than 110 are supposed to have been from his pen.[45]

44. Pleijel, *Svenska Kyrkans Historia*, p. 483.
45. Pleijel, *Das Kirchenproblem der Bruedergemeine in Schweden*, p. 26.

Still another controversial figure of the Stockholm Moravians was Magnus Brynolf Malmstedt, docent at Uppsala, whose beliefs inclined in the direction of Dippel's teachings. He came to Stockholm for nearby Uppsala sufficiently often to wield considerable influence.

The troubles in Stockholm at mid-century checked any gains that might have been made in middle Sweden at this time. There were only sporadic successes here and there. Significant for the future was a Herrnhut revival among Uppsala students in 1745. These men later spread Moravian teachings in all parts of Sweden in their pulpits and classrooms. Among the awakened was the later prominent churchman and theologian, Anders Knos.

Stability returned to the Stockholm Brethren with the return of a resident Diaspora worker in the person of the able Christian Gotthelf Ike, in 1760. The members were organized into a society, practically the equivalent of a congregation, except that it did not dispense the sacraments. The society held regular meetings but, out of fear of the authorities, had no fixed place until Bergrat Frederick Hjarne and his wife[46] provided one in 1770. With the Toleration Act of 1781 the Brethren were encouraged to go a step further, and in 1783 they secured permission to build their own hall on the Hjarne estate, including the privilege of holding unrestricted meetings, as long as the members continued faithful attendance upon the general services of the church and continued to avail themselves of its sacraments. Despite the continuance of the Conventicle Act of 1726, the Moravians secured this concession through royal edict.

Essentially the same development occurred in Goteborg, though preceded by some years of disfavor. Local authorities, following the suppression of the Brethren in Sweden in 1751, would not allow the presence of a resident Diaspora worker until 1769. During the intervening years the members were

---

46. The "Lebenslauf" of Lady Hjarne, 1722-1804, appearing in *Gemein Nachtrichten*, 1859, I, pp. 494-528, is a valuable document for the study of Moravianism in Sweden. Lady Hjarne tells of her husband and herself being first under the influence of Tolstadius and then being drawn to the Moravians. She throws light upon the dissensions in the Stockholm group. Included also is some detail concerning their gift to the Moravians.

served by Ostergren, who lived in a nearby village, and by Brethren from Stockholm and Copenhagen.[47] The work was sufficiently thriving for the organization of a society in 1766. In 1785 a royal edict granted the society permission to erect its own building, accompanied with the same privileges as granted two years earlier to the Stockholm society. Pleijel says: "The privileges of the Stockholm and Goteborg societies stand as something entirely new in Swedish church life."[48] They are indicative not only of the growing toleration, but also of the respect the Moravians had gained for themselves from the authorities.

This encouraging state of affairs during the latter third of the eighteenth century resulted in efforts to found a settlement congregation in Sweden with the intent of insuring the Brethren a permanent base of operations in the country. Though coming to nought, the episode is of interest in throwing additional light upon the status of the Moravians.

The impulse came from outside the Moravians themselves, namely, from the government official, Johan Gustaf Haldin,[49] who figures prominently in the story of Swedenborgianism. In his travels Haldin learned to know the Brethren and was so impressed that the idea possessed him that "such upright and practical Christians"[50] ought to be brought to Sweden. Especially motivating him was a report of the recently (1773) founded Moravian settlement of Christiansfeld, in Denmark, which was in charge of Jonathan Briant a native of Sweden. Halldin promised Briant to approach Gustav III on the subject. Cognizant of the previous Moravian troubles in Sweden, Briant was cautious, but did mention the matter to Moravian headquarters. Nothing more about the project was heard from Halldin, but the matter had aroused too much interest to be dropped.

The Brethren in Sweden themselves favored the project, and, in 1780, Adolph Stern, Diaspora worker in Stockholm, reported

---

47. August Roentgen, "Bericht von Gothenburg von Jahr 1852," in *Gemein Nachtrichten*, 1853, II, p. 73. This report gives a review of the early history of the society in connection with an anniversary celebration.
48. Pleijel, *Das Kirchenproblem der Bruedergemeine in Schweden*, p. 51.
49. Pleijel's *Das Kirchenproblem der Bruedergemeine in Schweden* gives a detailed account of the whole venture.
50. *Ibid.*, p. 46.

to the Unity's Elders' Conference that it was the "general wish" in Swedish Moravian circles that a settlement be established. Reluctant to proceed, the Conference postponed action until the next synod, at which time the matter was submitted to the lot with a negative result. Again, in 1784, when the Diaspora worker Gerner reported that an unnamed nobleman had resolved to approach the King about a Moravian colony in Sweden, the church authorities still delayed taking any initiative.

When Bishop Wingard of Goteborg, who had been of help in winning recognition for the Moravian society there, declared his willingness to help, the Moravian governing board appointed Ulrich Roslin, a Swede then in Germany, as its deputy to work with Wingard. The board also drew up a statement of the conditions under which the Moravian Church would undertake the project, insisting that the proposed colony be recognized as representing an independent episcopal church, directly under the authority of the King and royal council, rather than under the existing church authorities. Asked for were exemption for military service and the taking of oaths.

Wingard had hoped to bring the matter before the Riksdag of 1766, but, because of a struggle between Gustavus III and members of the Riksdag over the restoration of royal authority, the matter was shelved. The king needed the support of the clergy, who were solidly opposed to the Moravian Church project. Bishop Wingard was severely criticized by his colleagues for his support of the Moravians, yet he continued to work for them.

The King compromised by appointing an ecclesiastical commission consisting of two clerics and one layman to investigate the matter. The dominating member was the newly appointed Royal Councillor Nordin. Negotiations dragged on for two years until eventually, in 1788, Nordin's commission issued a report. Though expressing due appreciation of the Moravians, the report failed to recommend the terms the Moravians asked for, stating that the Moravian Church must be regarded as a sect. The commission further objected to exemption from bearing arms on the ground that it would attract to the Moravian Church those who sought to escape military service, and hence the safety of the

state would be endangered. The tone was critical of anything which treatened the unity of religion and ecclesiastical organization.

So ended what had appeared to be an undertaking of great promise. The series of events discloses the hierarchicalorthodox character of the Swedish church of that time as strong enough to insist upon uniformity of religion for the inhabitants. The hope for a Moravian church in Sweden did not entirely die out, being revived from time to time, but never in sufficient strength to result in successful action.

These years are the high water mark for the Moravians in Sweden, though without much organizational development, or any increase of personnel. There were innumerable informal Diaspora groups throughout the country which never organized into societies. Besides the two societies in Stockholm and Goteborg, there was one in Karlskrona and one in Uddevalla. These four localities were the main centers of influence. Holmquist, dating the period of rationalism in Sweden as falling between 1772 and 1817 says:

> Almost all of the earnest men in the Church at this time were of the Brethren or Swedenborgians, and these two beliefs were the salvation of the religious life of the country.[51]

The teaching of the Brethren continued to be held aloft by pastors, teachers, and others who were in active association with them. Especially influential was Spangenberg's *Idea Fidei Fratrum*,[52] issued in 1779, which had a deep appeal because it combined a strongly evangelical, Biblical position with loyalty to the church. Another great help to the Swedish pastors were the ties with the Herrnhut Ministers' Conference. The first contact between the Conference and Sweden was in 1771.[53] For the next fifty years the Conference letters had a wide circulation in Sweden. The connection continued, though with diminishing extent, until the last of the conferences in 1871. Pleijel describes the place of the Herrnhut gathering in the life of the Swedish pastors as follows:

---

51. *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, XI, p. 181.
52. See Chapter III, p. 64.
53. Steinecke, I, p. 188.

> In these letters the Swedish Herrnhut pastors poured out their hearts to the Brethren gathered in Herrnhut, describing their religious experience and the state of affairs in their parishes. Above all, they praised in highest tones the Gospel of the Crucified, the bond which held them together. When the pastors read of the conference proceedings in the circulated minutes, and when they heard that the conference included them in their thoughts and prayers, they were drawn more closely to the participants and to the place of meeting. When one tries to explain the widespread influence of Herrnhut piety in Sweden, one must not overlook the significance of the annual ministers' conference.[54]

What was really happening, however, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was the rise of forces destined to shape the religious life of Sweden in such a way as to decrease the importance of the Moravians. For one thing, even in the midst of the Neological period, the influence of certain men was preparing the way for new life within the state church.

Outstanding were such personalities as Henric Schartau (1757-1825), pastor at Lund; Samuel Odman (1750-1829), professor of theology at Uppsala and eminent naturalist; J. O. Wallin (1779-1839), Archbishop of Uppsala and great hymn writer; E. G. Geijer (1783-1837), a layman, but one of Sweden's great historians writing from a religious point of view.[55] These men, reacting both from the coldness of rationalism and the sentimentality of Pietism, brought back into the church a vital evangelicalism. Schartau is of particular interest to our study of the Moravians in that, until 1787, he was in connection with them. After breaking with them he was conspicuous for his strong opposition to them.[56] One of the objectionable features of Moravianism to him was the use of the lot. Wordsworth says of him:

> The great merit of his teaching was that it was strong and spiritual, and without the defects of Moravian or Pietistic sentimentality. Unlike the preachers of these schools, he held his head high and looked you well in the face. . . . He impressed at once learned professors

54. *Die Problem der Bruedergemeine in Schweden*, p. 15. The appendix to this volume, pp. 111-143 contains seventeen such letters.

55. John Wordsworth, *The National Church of Sweden*, Chicago, 1910, pp. 364-369.

56. Speaking of the followers of Schartau, one author says: "Another distinguishing feature is a great horror of the Moravians, founded on some unpleasant experiences of Schartau's own." *Cyclopedia of Ecclesiastical and Theological Literature*, Harpers, New York, 1894, IX, p. 403.

> and simple country folks, who thronged the cathedral from the district round Lund. . . . He set himself to develop strength and reverence apart from sentimentality, and in this way separated himself from the Pietists, and he valued the Church, and the sacraments and ordinances of the Church, in a way that they often failed to do.[57]

To this revitalization of the church must be added the rise of evangelical and reform movements of a more separatist nature. These competed for the allegiance of these interested in experiental religion. There were the "New Readers," opposing the Catechism and Prayer Book of 1810-1811; the revivals under Lars Laestadius; the community of Erik Jansson; the free-lance preaching of Karl Olof Rosenius. Important was the coming of George Scott, who introduced Methodism in 1830, who was soon followed by the Baptists. Bringing vitality to religious life in general was the attention directed to practical reforms. Leader of the temperance movement was Peter Wieselgren (1800-1877), successively teacher, librarian and pastor at Lund, and for twenty years Provost of Goteborg Cathedral. The influence of the Swedenborgians during the Neological period has already been referred to.

Somehow these movements eventually crowded the Moravians to the sidelines, and more and more their influence receded until it was limited largely to the immediate circle of their four closed societies. Holmes, writing in the mid-eighteen twenties reports that the members in Sweden are descreasing. His scant reference to the work for the year preceding his writing is as follows:

> Ministers of the Brethren's Church were stationed in the towns of Stockholm, Gothenburg, Carlscrona and Uddewalle, who traveled through the surrounding districts, ministering spiritual counsel to the members of the Society and to many other serious families and individuals, who readily opened their cottages to them and gladly listened to their message of peace.[58]

Interest in foreign missions came to Sweden in the second quarter of the century, and as elsewhere in Europe, brought some new life to the Diaspora, but no increase in numbers. The chief

---

57. *The National Church of Sweden*, pp. 364-365.
58. *History of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren*, II, p. 229.

effect was to transform the dwindling Diaspora groups into missionary societies. When the mission awakening came the Moravians were still influential enough to be included among the forces who gave impetus to it. They may still be credited also as contributing to the general religious revival during the second quarter of the century, though by no means does their position compare in importance with that of the previous century. Latourette says of this period:

> To Sweden came a variety of influences. Halle, the Moravians, Basel, the British foreign missionary movement, British Methodism and contact with the revivalism of the United States all made themselves felt. Sweden, and indeed, all of Scandinavia, awakened to a more earnest religious life than it had ever known.[59]

By mid-century the Swedish Diaspora was supporting only two workers, those stationed at Goteborg and Stockholm. In his memoir,[60] the man who was the last resident Diaspora worker at Uddevalla recalls his years between 1837 and 1849, stating that the clergy were opposed to the Moravians and had gradually succeeded in discouraging attendance upon the meetings of his society. He refers to scattered adherents in surrounding villages. The Karlskrona society apparently had been discontinued some years earlier, for there are only scattered references to it in various church reports, and these in the past tense.

A report from Stockholm[61] in 1853 gives the membership of the society there as forty-nine. However, because of property holdings, there was an income which made possible a rather extended activity on behalf of foreign and inner missions. The society at Goteborg was even smaller, according to a report[62] for the years 1855-1856, having only sixteen adherents. But, as in Stockholm, there was much more activity than this number would indicate, including a girls' school of fifty pupils and a Sunday School of seventy pupils. The Diaspora worker did extensive visiting, mentioning Skoane and Toarp as part of his circuit.

---

59. *History of the Expansion of Christianity*, IV, p. 93.
60. "Lebenslauf of Karl Peter Hellström," *Gemein Nachtrichten*, 1858, I, p. 525.
61. "Bericht des Brueder's Senft von der Brueder-Societ in Stockholm von Jahr 1853," *Gemein Nachtrichten*, 1854, II, pp. 288-300.
62. "Bericht des Bruder's C. E. Burckhardt von der Societaet in Göthenburg in Jahr 1855 under 1865," *Gemein Nachtrichten*, 1858, II, 120-121.

The same reasons for the decline of the Diaspora in Germany during the second half of the nineteenth century apply to Sweden. The free church movement, released from legal restrictions by more liberal church laws, was more attractive to the type of person who would have previously affiliated himself with the Moravians. For the past one hundred years there have usually been two Diaspora workers in Sweden, in reality Moravian mission agents, distributing their literature, giving talks, visiting individuals. Conspicuous among the literature is the Swedish edition of *Daily Texts*, of which 30,000 are printed annually.

An unfortunate controversy in Goteborg cost the Moravians the ownership of their headquarters in that city shortly after World War I. Disagreeing with the Moravian Church on policy, the minister in charge severed his connections with the Moravians, forming an independent society which claimed the right to the property on the basis that the Moravians had departed from the terms of the bequest through which they had acquired it. The matter dragged on in the courts for several years with an eventual decision against the Moravians.[63] For a few years after that the church's Diaspora worker remained in Goteborg and carried on without a fixed meeting place. Of recent years he has moved to Stockholm, the only remaining center of the Moravians in Sweden, where a substantial vested interest supports the work.[64]

For an insight into the present status of the Swedish Diaspora we read as follows from a letter of the retired missionary, David I. Haglund, residing in Stockholm:

> Pastor Erich Marx of Herrnhut is in charge of the only Moravian Church that exists in Sweden. It is situated in the very center of the city. It is a lovely Saal in the first story of the big Moravian house, with a seating capacity of about 300, and equipped with a fine pipe organ. As there exists no enrolled membership, the pastor's work is varied. He holds Sunday School every Sunday morning in Kristineberg, a nearby suburb and preaching service at six in the evening in the Saal. . . . Several times a year social meetings are kept when talks on missions, Moravian history, or other timely subjects are

63. *Mittheilungen aus der Bruedergemeine*, January-February, 1929, p. 25.
64. See Chapter V, p.

given. . . . A summer camp for children has lately been opened. There exists a small organization—about 100 members—called Friends of the Moravian Missions, to whom he administers the Holy Communion to, about twenty who come twice a year, and he frequently visits those who are sick both in home and the various hospitals.

Pastor Harald Padel from Herrnhut is the head of the Moravian work in Sweden, and stays in Malarhojden, another suburb. The chapel there belongs to the state church and is let to the Moravians. Pastor Padel being accredited by the state church, conducts all public services in the chapel according to state church usage and rituals. He performs infant baptisms, confirmations, marriages and funerals. Besides these official duties he and his able wife keep an endless chain of meetings and gatherings in real Moravian style, that is meetings for men, for women, for boys, for girls, Sunday School for children, etc. Very active sewing societies have big bazaars twice a year. Gifts and collections for missions are generous.

Since the entire work in Stockholm, as well as part of the monies for foreign missions, is supported from old legacies, it is very requisite to have a local treasurer who is in charge of that part of the work. He is Willi Landt from Hamburg. . . .

At present there is a pensioned missionary couple, the Reverend and Mrs. David I. Haglund, both Swedes, who in proportion to their gradually ebbing strength endeavor to promote the interest of foreign missions in the little blessed country in the far north. . . . Mrs. Haglund frequently gives mission talks in various denominations and is at present one of the leaders of an interdenominational Women's Prayer Union in Stockholm. Mr. Haglund often extends his deputy work to remote places both north and south of the capital city. With the help of films, slides and stories based upon his twenty-eight years of active service in Nicaragua, he finds open doors in a number of towns where people hitherto knew little or nothing about the Moravian Church and its global circling missions. . . .

A Student's Home under the leadership of Miss Lisa Lundmark must here be briefly mentioned. Young student girls from all over the country come to Stockholm. . . . For a small fee they can find in the Moravian Home for Students all what a Christian home life reasonable can offer, a matter of no small spiritual importance in a large city at the present time.

. . . . Noteworthy is also that the readers of the *Daily Texts* are invited to a gathering once a year. Many come and have a blessed time together.

A small paper, *Brodramission*, is issued quarterly, containing the latest news about Moravian missions. This little paper serves as a connecting link between the many friends of the Moravian Church

the entire country over.

The attitude of the state church pastors toward the Moravians is generally very good. Pastor Padel's case is mentioned. Pastor Marx has just been accepted as assistant pastor in the German church in Stockholm, which also stands under the state church of Sweden. Our missionary Haglund is frequently asked to preach at Sunday afternoons on his many journeys.

To foresee the future development of the Moravian work in Sweden requires a prophet. Nobody can even foretell the future of the present state church of Sweden. If, as many pastors believe, state and church sever, then, if ever the Moravian Church would have a chance to extend. But for such steps very valiant men are required, and such are seemingly few and far between.[56]

As we review the more than two centuries of Moravianism in Sweden, we see quite clearly that the external evidence points to a steady decline. Yet it would be misleading to conclude that the church life of Sweden, even at the present time, does not bear a strong imprint of the work of the Brethren. As this chapter has pointed out, even at the height of Herrnhut's most flourishing period in Sweden, there were only five Diaspora workers stationed there. Moravianism among the Swedes has been, from the start, a quickening of spiritual life within Lutheranism. The organizational aspects of it were always relatively unimportant, and, therefore, it is impossible to measure the Brethren's influence in those terms.

In fact, the very success of the Moravians in bringing the vitality of Pietism into the Swedish Church was a reason for Moravianism never assuming much of an overt form. The type of religious expression Herrnhut stood for became an integral part of the state church, through the scores of awakened pastors. Though outwardly the connection with Herrnhut was often only in the background, the impulse unmistakably came from Herrnhut. After Moravian Pietism had permeated the life of the land, the work of the Diaspora was no longer necessary. The outward decline of its activity in Sweden, so long as its spiritual fruits remained, would not have troubled Zinzendorf in the least. To him the Brethren had a mission to perform; that mission accomplished, they could move on to a new field. This was essentially

65. Mr. Haglund wrote this survey of the Moravian work in Sweden on December 14, 1950, in response to a request from the writer of this study.

the Diaspora strategy of the Count. The Moravians came nearer to following this in Sweden than anywhere else. Had it not been for the acquiring of property in Stockholm, in the form of the Hjarne bequest, they would probably not be in Sweden at all today. In so vitally affecting Swedish religious life in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Herrnhut made a lasting contribution.[66]

---

66. One observer sums it up by pointing to two specific contributions of the Moravians, the preaching of a "living Gospel," that is the emphasis upon a personal relationship between Christ and the believer, and the concept of "fellowship." The latter expresses itself in the existence of fellowship societies in the Swedish Church. The former is still a marked feature in much of Swedish preaching. This is the observation of Dr. Waldemar Reichel, a member of the governing board of the Moravian Church in Germany. Through his marriage to a Swedish woman, a daughter of a professor at Uppsala, he has become conversant with the church life of Sweden. He expressed this opinion to the writer while on a visit to the United States in the fall of 1951.

Another observation is that of a contemporary Swedish writer who states that the Moravians in Sweden tended to give Swedish Pietism a Zinzendorfian bent which has carried over to the present day. Herrnhutism thus continues to play a powerful role in the spiritual life of Sweden today. Hjalmar Lindroth, in a review of a doctoral dissertation at Lund by Gustaf Dahlbacks, "Den gamla och den nya manniskan in Lars Levi Laestadius teologi," writing in *Ny Kyrklig Tideskrift*, Uppsala, 1950, nos. 5-6, pp. 139-142.

CHAPTER VIII

The Ministers' Conference at Herrnhut

Beginning in the year 1754 and continuing for 117 years the annual Ministers' Conference at Herrnhut was intimately associated with the Diaspora outreach of the Moravian Church. Though under the auspices of the Brethren, the conference was made up largely of pastors, teachers and ministerial candidates of the state churches. Through its network of correspondence it made contact with like-minded ministers in many lands.

Concerning the origin of the gathering, from the minutes of the year 1804, the fiftieth anniversary year, we read:

> It was in the year 1754 on the fifth of June that seven ministers of the Gospel of the Lutheran Church met for the first time at Berthelsdorf near Herrnhut jointly to converse with each other on attending to the duties of the Gospel ministry entrusted to their care in a dignified and conscientious manner. These ministers were: (1) Charles Rudolf Reichel of Neukirch, (2) his brother, John Frederick Reichel of Taubenheim, (3) John Benade of Milkel, (4) Paul Groh of Berthelsdorf, (5) Christlieb Gottfrey Loene of Lower Hermsdorf in Misnia, (6) John Frederick Michaelis of Hermsdorf near Goerlitz and (7) Michael Frederick Franz, deacon of Klix.
>
> These men, dear to our memory, who are all gone into eternity and into the joy of their Lord, met for the first time fifty years ago, attended by some members of the Brethrens' Church, men of experience and knowledge as to the ways of the Lord, and the guidance of souls, for to converse with each other in cordial love and confidence, on the fruitful performance of the functions of a Gospel minister and to communicate unto each other in a brotherly way their insight and experience on that head.
>
> The chief aim of their meeting together, which on this memorial day thereof, we ought justly to call to mind, was this:
>
> (1) To encourage each other, for to proclaim boldly by the Gospel of peace and neither through reproach nor shame nor thro' other hindrance to suffer themselves to be thwarted in their important call, to be faithful servants of their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.
>
> (2) To communicate unto each other their past experience both of a pleasant and unpleasant nature, to praise God for the former, and as to the latter to encourage each other, for to persevere amidst all difficulties and not to be wearied.
>
> (3) To make each other acquainted with their insight into the Gospel, and their knowledge as to particular incidents of office, as also to commune with each other on the likeliest methods of making

their sermons conformable to the Gospel truths and to the safe keeping of souls, and

(4) To covenant with each other in cordial love, in the presence of Jesus, for to walk as patterns of the flock and according to one rule, and to approximate more and more that great aim of saving themselves and those that hear them.[1]

The founding of the conference was an outgrowth of the interest of outsiders in the Herrnhut community. This interest, very strong in the early days of the settlement, had been suppressed during the banishment of Zinzendorf and the hostility of the Saxon authorities toward the Brethren. With the turn of the tide in favor of the Moravians we find, beginning about 1750, a growing number of sympathizers. Included among these were many pastors in surrounding neighborhoods. It was from among the circle of these pastors[2] who wished to spread the spirit of Herrnhut among their parishioners that the nucleus of the ministers' conference was drawn.

Zinzendorf[3] himself was probably the moving spirit back of the project. He wished to have the ministers share in the meetings of the Brethren in the same way that many of the laity were already sharing. It was the Count's wish that the conference be held at another place, Taubenheim, for instance, the parish of John Frederick Reichel, one of the charter members. However, the Lutheran pastors themselves preferred Herrnhut as the place and a Moravian as the presiding officer.[4] Thus it came about that the direction of the affair was placed in the hands of the Brethren.

The original plan was to meet quarterly, and for a number of years this was the case. The first interruption of the quarterly plan came during the Seven Years' War, and after 1765 the gathering became an annual affair. With the exception of the year 1813, when the battle of Bautzen interfered, there was no year between 1754 and 1871 when the ministers did not gather at

1. "Minutes of the Herrnhut Ministers' Conference, some ideas drawn up by Christian Gottlieb Frohberger, pastor of the Lutheran congregation at Rennersdorf, and for thirty years past a member of the Ministers' Conference, by occasion of the Jubilee Conference kept at Herrnhut," 1804, MS in Moravian Archives.

2. Cranz, p. 449.

3. He was present at three of the gatherings, the last one just three weeks before his death.

4. Steinecke, I, p. 184.

Herrnhut. At first the date was fixed as the Wednesday after Pentecost, but after 1778, out of consideration for those coming from a distance, as the Wednesday after Trinity Sunday.[5]

Numerically the Herrnhut conference seems insignificant. For the first twenty-five years it consisted of a mere handful, the highest attendance being eighteen. But before the end of the century it was averaging seventy-five. The highest number was in the year 1814 when ninety-nine were present.[6] During the conference's later years the average attendance was sixty. However, a study of the minutes reveals that those present represented only a small segment of a large fellowship. One of the chief features of the day's proceedings was the reading of letters from those who were members of an evangelical school of thought of which the conference was the focal point. These letters were from all the provinces of Germany, and outside of Germany from Austria, Hungary, Transylvania, Russia, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, England, France, Switzerland, the United States and various mission fields where Europeans were stationed. Not only was there extensive correspondence with individuals, but also with similar ministers' conferences elsewhere, the formation of which was not in a few instances inspired by the mother conference at Herrnhut.

Throughout its life the Herrnhut ministers' conference was kept on a very personal informal level. In fact for many years it even dispensed with any formal announcement as to its convening. Those who attended or who had received the circulated reports of the proceedings were aware of the time and passed the word around privately. It was a case of kindred spirits getting together without any desire for publicity. The relatively small size of the group was one of the secrets of its appeal. With essentially the same personnel attending year after year, the turnover was small, and newcomers gained entrance usually through the sponsorship of a friend. Some who had the desire to attend wrote to Herrnhut for permission to become a part of the group. On several occasions the question arose whether the conference

5. Minutes of 1804, MS in Moravian Archives.
6. Steinecke, I, p. 185.

should be a closed one. Each time the decision was in the negative. Any one of a sympathetic point of view was welcome, the only condition, for the sake of orderly procedure, was that a candidate either apply ahead of time or be recommended by a friend.[7]

Looking at the program which changed little during the course of its long history, we note three features which shaped its character: (1) Its deliberations were primarily in the realm of practical pastoral problems. Because different confessions were represented it strictly avoided doctrinal discussions. The pastors were not concerned with what to preach, for those identified with the movement were well agreed on that, but on the best methods of preaching. Consequently such questions as homiletics, catechetical instruction, the care of souls, the life of a pastor, were frequently on the agenda. (2) The conference bore strongly the imprint of Moravianism. All of the members were in close fraternal contact with the Brethren's Church and in those parishes where circumstances permitted were sponsors of Diaspora meetings. The annual gatherings were a center from which was disseminated the Moravian point of view with its emphasis upon "heart religion." Increasingly as time went on the pastors returned to their parishes as enthusiasts for Moravian missions and foreign missions in general. (3) Finally the conference was a purely spiritual fellowship, and as such was a continuing phase of Zinzendorf's ideal of a "Congregation of God in the Spirit." The purpose as expressed in the above quotation from the fiftieth anniversary address remained constant. Occasionally there were expressions of sentiment that the conference ought to come to conclusions and pass resolutions, but the response to such suggestions was always in the negative. For instance:

> As in 1839 plans were proposed that the conference change its nature, the principle was adhered to that the conference was not a synod, but a coming together for the expression of brotherhood and a mutual strengthening in the work of the Lord. Unity, love, trust, are and remain the important things. The conference is a medium for a union of kindred spirits.[8]

7. Minutes of 1788, MS in Moravian Archives.
8. Minutes of 1839, cited by Steinecke, I, p. 192.

The agenda, drawn up by the Moravian Unity's Elders' Conference, usually consisted of an address by one of the older members,[9] the discussion of subjects agreed upon in advance, the reading of letters, a Moravian lovefeast, and frequently an address by a retired missionary or missionary on furlough. The questions discussed reflected, naturally, the thought currents of the years. In the latter part of the eighteenth century the struggle with Rationalism was uppermost in the discussion. There was frequent reference as to how the Gospel minded ministers can best combat infidelity. During the French Revolution the question arose as to what attitude a minister should take toward the revolutionists. Again in 1817 there was a discussion on the matter of church union.

The close relationship between the school of thought represented by the conference and the rise of the Inner Mission movement is revealed in the discussion of the year 1849. A news item in the *Moravian Miscellany* in summarizing the activities of the Brethren in Europe during that year refers to the Herrnhut conference as follows:

> Brother F. W. Koelbing opened the discussion by communicating some remarks from a lately published work of Wichern on the "Inner mission of the German Evangelical Church," of which the following is the substance:
>
> The revolutions of the last year have only brought to light those social evils which existed long ago, and which were secretly spreading more and more; new political institutions are of no avail. Socialism will only cause greater destruction; only the Gospel can bring salvation. This conviction is the foundation of the Inner Mission. . . . Similar conferences, principally consisting of ministers of the respective churches of the state were held in Gnadau. Gnadenberg, and for the first time in Neudietendorf. In reference to the latter we find the following remarks: "The principal topic of discussion in the meeting was the Inner Mission."[10]

But more often the deliberations centered around the timeless problem of the state of a man's soul. Invariably there was the mutual sharing of intimate personal spiritual experience, a sort

---

9. Spangenberg during the last twenty-five years of his life was invariably the one to give the key-note address. Reichel of Neukirch also was one of the venerable characters whose words directed the thinking of the group.

10. *Moravian Miscellany*, 1851, pp. 215-216.

of testimonial meeting for pastors in the presence of their peers, an opportunity seldom afforded to most of them in the course of their ministerial duties. In this connection the conference took on the nature of a prayer union, and in 1799 it was resolved that members pray for one another at stated times during the course of the year.

Because so much of the proceedings were of this intimate nature the minutes were not printed[11] during most of the 117 years, but were in the form of multiplied handwritten copies circulated from person to person. The main portion of these minutes consisted of a resume of the main address, brief quotations of statements of those present, and the letters which had been read. The most revealing aspect of the records are these letters which demonstrate quite clearly that the Herrnhut conference was an important phase of the Moravian Diaspora.

Among the most faithful of the correspondents was a group of ministers who comprised a small conference of their own in Basel.[12] Their communications report the existence there of numerous little cell groups of earnest Christians whose purposes were in common with the Brethren. Through the years the Basel company looked upon their contact with the Herrnhut group as a source of inspiration.

One of the most interesting contacts of the conference was with the men who founded the London Mission Society in 1794.

> As an introduction to the writing next to be read Brother Reichel gave some account of the first beginning of the well known missionary society in England and observed that the founders of it, when they heard of the blessed labor of the Brethren among the heathen, directly made application to them and asked their advice with regard to their undertaking, that then also the Ministers' Conference which

---

11. The minutes were printed in 1849 for the first time, and then only for private circulation. This is one of the reasons why information on the conference is relatively scarce. Moravian periodicals merely mention that the conference had been held or would be held as usual. The Moravian Archives in Bethlehem has only a partial collection of the annual reports. The only printed set of minutes available in Bethlehem seems to be for the year 1853. The writer therefore has had to rely heavily on Steinecke who had access to the more abundant material in Herrnhut.

12. It was this circle of ministers who were the moving spirits in the formation of the well known Basel Society, one of the early missionary societies in continental Europe.

is kept here was communicated to them and that a writing has been received in the name of the directors of said missionary society to this Conference, which was read.[13]

The communication referred to reads in part as follows:

> You are met in the bonds of Christian love and fellowship, as ministers of the Brethren of the Evangelical Lutheran and Calvinistic church, out of love to our Saviour firmly knit together through his blood and the power of the Spirit, and you look upon your differences in other things as nothing in comparison to the glorious truth in which you join. . . .
>
> To the Brethrens' Unity we look upon with great veneration as to our older Brethren in the house of our Father in the mission affair and we are, according to our measures now likewise endeavoring to proclaim Jesus and His salvation in heathenish countries. Like you we form a union of various denominations, ministers and members of the Episcopal Church, Presbyterians, Independents and Methodists, and form together a harmonious society which the blood of Jesus hath cemented and which heartily agrees in that precious truth that the only way for a sinner to be saved is if Christ in God is made unto him wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption.[14]

Another well known English organization, the British and Foreign Bible Society, founded in 1803, also was part of the fellowship. In 1853 the only surviving member of the founders of the Bible society was the clergyman Carl Frederick Steinkopf. In that year he sent his greetings[15] to the Herrnhut conference and takes note of the fact that he had recently had the privilege of participating in the fiftieth anniversary of the society. His letter reveals that the contact with Herrnhut had been a great help in the work which the society was attempting to do.

In the year 1800 there is record of still another contact with England in the reference to a letter from a "Union of Christians," comprised of about forty ministers in Bedford. This group had been in correspondence with Herrnhut for some years previous.[16]

In the same year a minister of Gothenburg, Sweden, writes of his acquaintance with twenty Gospel ministers in his land and of

---

13. Minutes of 1799, MS in Moravian Archives.
14. *Ibid.*
15. "The Minutes of the Ministers' Conference Held at Herrnhut, May 25, 1853," as printed in *The Moravian Magazine*, London, 1854, p. 118.
16. Minutes of 1800, MS in Moravian Archives.

his recommending to them the fellowship of the conference. Also in the same year the Brethren had the pleasure of reading a letter from the first assistant of the bishop of the cathedral at Gothenburg. This divine speaks of having been a reader of the minutes of the Herrnhut conference for thirty-nine years, during which time they had given him "instruction, direction and warm encouragement."

In the year 1791 from Vandsoe, Norway came this communication:

> I am unspeakably thankful for your kind remembrances and for the answer you favored me with. Whoever has never been hungry, such an one has no idea what a hungry person has to suffer, and the same case it is in spiritual things. We must have made the experience what it is to desire after fellowship, to be so far distant, in order to comprehend rightly what a comfort and refreshment it was to my poor heart, as I received your kind answer and saw myself poor and desolate, as I am, all at once received amongst so many dear Brethren. Since last year I have made a change of office, for I have received in October, 1790, a call to Norway in order to succeed my father, I get there a congregation of 6000 souls, an extensive field. There are many here who have a taste for the Gospel. Some awakened form a society. I can not describe how agreeable this call was to me, for I desire most fervently to see fruits and to gain souls for the Lord, which joy I never have had in my former office.[17]

From Reformed church territory a pastor from Ottingen, with a congregation of 1200 members, wrote that in Alsace ministers who were in connection with the Brethren would occasionally get together. At one time he states there were as many as twenty-one at such a meeting.[18]

The direct connection between the conference and the Diaspora societies is revealed in the following communication from a German pastor:

> If but also we would have the favor and good fortune to be visited by Brethren this would be a great benefit to me and the poor souls, yea it is highly necessary. I recommend it to the Brethren as a matter of conscience. . . . I am sure that the connection with the Brethrens' Congregation and the visits of the Brethren are of blessed consequence.[19]

---

17. Minutes of 1791, MS in Moravian Archives.
18. Minutes of 1790, MS in Moravian Archives.
19. Minutes of 1788, MS in Moravian Archives.

The letter goes on to speak of the problem of persuading the religiously awakened to conduct themselves in orderly fashion in keeping with church rules. He commends the Brethren because they had proven their capacity to give the societies of the awakened proper guidance and direction.

Besides the church bodies already mentioned Baptists and Mennonites began to be represented before the turn of the century. Surprisingly, there was also some contact with Roman Catholics.[20] In 1814 an eighty year old priest asked for the prayers of the conference. In 1812 one priest attended, in 1817 there were three, and in 1818 four present. A few priests here and there was regular readers of the conference minutes. Among Catholic laity the wife of archduke Joseph Palatinus of Austria read these reports.

The correspondents included some religious figures prominent during the era in which the conference flourished. Among them were Christian Barth, eminent divine and philanthropist, founder of the first missionary society of Wuerttemberg; John Jacob Hess, in 1795 chosen antistes or president of the clergy of Canton Zurich; John Gottfried Schoener of Nuremberg, well known pastor and hymnwriter; John Frederick von Meyer, theologian and jurist of Frankfort on the Main.[21]

By the middle of the nineteenth century the conference had reached the peak of its influence. Aware of this, its leaders tried to alter it to conform to changed conditions. The change from handwritten to printed reports was a move in this direction. In 1849 it was definitely announced as a conference open to the public. But the annual meeting had lost its vitality, even though the brief news items about it in Moravian publications show that the attendance continued at near the average level to the very end.

The reasons for the abandonment of the Herrnhut ministers' conference are essentially the same as those for the change in the Diaspora during the second half of the nineteenth century, as described in a previous chapter. The conference lost its reason

---

20. Steinecke, I, p. 188.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 186.

for being because its work was no longer necessary. As Steinecke says: "What had been its strength was also its weakness. The love of the Savious was no longer a unique quality of the Brethren's Church."[22] The type of religious life of which the conference was a rallying point had, with the coming of free churches in greater number, become a common possession of European churchmen. Other gatherings on the local and regional level, or conferences called into existence for specific purposes, more accessible and convenient to varying situations, had sprung up everywhere. The effort to make the affair more all-inclusive failed in that it destroyed the character of the conference which had given it its original appeal. In 1871 it met for the last time.[23]

Little need be said of the obvious significance of the Herrnhut conference. It was for a century, particularly in its first half of that period, an important factor in the spread of Diaspora societies. It was a source of vitality for both the Moravian and the state churches. It kept the Brethren in touch with the larger religious life of the continent and beyond, while at the same time it was a channel through which the Brethren could pass on to others the spiritual warmth of their pietism.

The Herrnhut Ministers' Conference highlights the fact that the Moravian Church in Europe has represented, and still represents, primarily not a denomination, but a certain evangelical Christian point of view. This was brought to expression in Zinzendorf's heart religion in which the essential was the "blood and merits of the Lamb of God." In this the historic, human Jesus who lived on earth and suffered and died for the atonement of human sins, occupied the central position. Personal consciousness of and intimate fellowship with the suffering Saviour were the concerns uppermost in this brand of evangelicalism.

The Moravians in organizing their Brotherhood around this type of Christian experience soon became the symbol and rallying point for it. Hence terms like Moravianism, Herrnhutism, Zinzendorfianism, refer not just to the religious life of members of the Moravian Church, but to heart religion as widely dissemi-

22. Steinecke, I, p. 199.
23. The writer has been unable to find in any source information on the details of the end of the conference.

nated throughout the state churches. It was the pastors of this persuasion who were in fellowship with Herrnhut, where possible by direct personal contact, and otherwise by correspondence and by reading Moravian literature. It is obvious from what we observe concerning the ministers' conference why Moravian influence cannot be evaluated in terms of statistics.

CHAPTER IX

The Effect of the Diaspora Upon the American Moravian Church

The story of the Diaspora would not be complete without a reference to the American Moravian Church, for the Diaspora spirit has had a pronounced effect upon the development of Moravianism on this side of the Atlantic. The Moravian Church was organically closer to the parent church in Europe than were other Protestant bodies in America. It took much longer than most in achieving independence. With the Brethren in Europe more Diaspora than denomination minded the Brethren in America, governed in large part from Europe, could not help but act along the same lines.

From the outset there was a strong spirit of inter-denominationalism in the series of events that brought the Moravians to America. The Moravians were establishing themselves here in those very years when the Count was most determined to prevent the Brethren from separating themselves from the state churches on the Continent and in England. It was during these years that his tropus plan was being formulated. The separation had already begun to take place, for by the time the Moravians came to America they had already taken over the episcopate from the surviving incumbents of the Bohemian Brethren. But Zinzendorf was still hoping to confine the use of the independent orders to the foreign mission enterprise. The new world presented to him mainly three kinds of opportunity, missions among the Indians, the establishment of closed communities on the Herrnhut pattern, and radiating from these the Diaspora form of ministry among the different sects.

After an unsuccessful attempt to found a permanent settlement in Georgia the Brethren began their Pennsylvania settlements in 1740. Building operations began in what was to be Bethlehem early in 1741. Formal organization took place in June of the following year with Zinzendorf himself present for the occasion. While this first permanent Moravian center was being born the Pennsylvania Synods were taking place, namely, from January to June of 1742. Much has been written about these

synods,[1] so we need not detain ourselves long in reviewing them. As efforts toward a union or federation of the score or more of sects in Pennsylvania they were failures, but upon the Moravians they had a far-reaching effect. They were foremost among the means by which Zinzendorf tried to establish Moravianism in America, not as a denomination, but as an interdenominational "Congregation of God in the Spirit."[2] Following the seven synods in 1742 the effort toward a union was continued in the form of quarterly conferences for several more years, during which time the Moravians conceived of their activities in Pennsylvania as projects of a union church. Apparently it was only the Moravians who took the synods seriously, as we discover upon closer examination.

The religious chaos of sectarianism among the Pennsylvania Germans was one of the challenges which induced Zinzendorf to come over personally. He stayed in America for fourteen months, from November of 1741 to January of 1743, arriving in time to be present at all seven of the synods. Though Henry Antes of Frederick Township near Philadelphia was the actual convener, the Count from the start was the dominating influence.

It is clear from the proceedings that the synods started out as genuine interdenominational gatherings. Lutherans, Reformed, Moravians, Quakers, Mennonites, Dunkers, Ephrata Monks, Schwenkfelders, the Inspired and Separatists were all present. The total number of delegates for the first four meetings averaged about one hundred. Actually the Moravians were not able to be represented as an organized church in America until the seventh synod. Shortly before, on June 7, the first "Sea Congregation"[3] of fifty-six members under Peter Boehler had arrived in Philadelphia and were admitted to membership in the synod convening

1. Both manuscript and printed copies of the minutes of the synods are in the Moravian Archives in Bethlehem. Both Levering in his *History of Bethlehem*, and Sessler in his *Communal Pietism* have good accounts of the proceedings.

2. The common designation for the union church as conceived by Zinzendorf and others at the synods.

3. Three groups of Moravian immigrants in 1742, 1743 and 1749 respectively, organized themselves while at sea into congregations just as if they were regular permanent congregations. These were known as the "Sea Congregations."

on June 13. This was the first recognition by the Pennsylvania Synods of the Moravian Church as an independent body. The official record of the seventh synod reads:

> Henry Antes testified in the name of all, that the undenominational (unpartheyisches) Synod of Pennsylvania recognized in general, the arriving old Moravian Church as a true Church of the Lamb; in particular, its ministers as brethren and fellow-laborers; but, in accordance with the fundamental rules of the Synod, on the other hand, the Church, in itself, as independent, and within its own limits and regulations, with which the Synod never meddled, as inviolate; and wished that the grace of the Lamb might rule over them.[4]

In speaking of the small Moravian representation up to the last synod it should be borne in mind that some in attendance who were registered as Lutherans or Reformed had become Diaspora adherents of the Moravians. Such was the case, for instance, with Antes himself and with John Bechtel, also of the Reformed Church. Later these men became outright members of the Moravian Church. Again this brings into view Zinzendorf's tropus plan. Neither in Pennsylvania nor in Europe did he have in mind organic church union.

After the fourth synod all but the Lutheran, Reformed and Moravians deserted the venture. However, the synods did not completely cease to function after the sessions between January and June of 1742, voting to continue their efforts by holding quarterly ministerial conferences. These gatherings continued with a show of being union conferences until 1745, but actually were Moravian gatherings. For instance, in the meeting of 1745 the minutes[5] show Lutherans, Reformed, Anglicans, Scotch, Moravians, Baptists and Separatists present. A study of the names and places they came from reveals them to be mostly those in active fellowship with the Moravians. The records also reveal that the subject matter of the conferences became more and more exclusively devoted to Moravian interests, such as their preaching places, schools and missions. In 1746 and 1747 the pretense of being union conferences was abandoned and the meetings were referred to as synods of the Brethren.

---

4. Cited by J. H. Levering, *A History of Bethlehem*, p. 115.
5. Cited by Sessler, p. 59.

The Count was in charge of the formal organization of Bethlehem as a congregation on June 25, 1742, a day which climaxes three days of religious services. It is obvious from a study of early Bethlehem that it was difficult for the Moravians to escape from their leader's ideal of a church within a church. The pattern was set, and for a century, even under a totally different set of conditions, Bethlehem and later its counterparts, Salem in North Carolina and Lititz in Pennsylvania, were to be for America what Herrnhut and other Moravian settlements were for Germany. The fact that church authority remained centered in Herrnhut so long helped to perpetuate this state of affairs. Moravians in their small self-contained settlements, under strict church discipline, with quaint social arrangements, were looked upon as a people apart from the world, specializing in piety and foreign missions. Even in the dozen or so congregations of the colonial era outside of Bethlehem, Moravianism was thought of in terms of its relationship to Bethlehem, and through Bethlehem in terms of its relationship to Herrnhut. During the first few years after the organization of Bethlehem receptions to Moravian membership actually took place in Bethlehem, though the person being received might be residing elsewhere.[6]

The Bethlehem community upon its organization in 1742 was divided into two sections, the Home Congregation (Hausgemeine) and the Pilgrim Congregation (Pilgergemeine). The latter is not to be confused with the Pilgergemeine organized by Zinzendorf at the time of his exile as a sort of traveling executive body standing at the head of the Church. In Bethlehem-Nazareth[7] the Home Congregation occupied itself with maintaining the economic base of the community, while the Pilgrim Congregation occupied itself with evangelistic work among the Indians and the unchurched white settlers. Membership in either group was not fixed, and there were frequent transfers from one division to the other.

---

6. Levering, p. 156.
7. Bethlehem and Nazareth, nine miles apart, were operated as joint communities. Handcraft industries tended to be concentrated in Bethlehem, while Nazareth was the center of farming operations.

The sending forth of the first pilgrim band, ten in number three weeks[8] after the organization of Bethelhem was reminiscent of the sending out of the Diaspora workers from Herrnhut in 1727. The men were instructed to put forth every effort to win people for Christ and not to enter into religious controversy or to interfere with the work of other churches. They were told to make Christians, not Moravians.[9] Alongside of centers of religious worship they also established schools for children, and in less than four years they had started fifteen such.

By 1748 the Brethren in the North had thirty-one localities outside of Bethlehem-Nazareth where religious ministrations were carried on. These were as follows: Germantown, Philadelphia, Lancaster, York, Donegal, Heidelberg, Quitopehilla, (later Hebron and eventually Lebanon), Warwick (Lititz), Oley, Allemaengel, Maguntschi (Emmaus), Salisbury, Falkner's Swamp, the Trappe, Mahanatawny, Neshaminy, and Dansbury in Pennsylvania; Monocacy (Graceham) in Maryland; Maurice River, Racoon, Penn's Neck, Oldman's Creek, Pawlin's Kill, Walpeck and Brunswick in New Jersey; Staten

---

8. The Bethlehem Diary for July 15, 1742 refers to them as "fishers in the land." Their names were Leonard Schnell, Gottlieb Petzhold, George Kaske, Christopher Heine, Frederick Post, Gottlieb Enter, Joseph Shaw, John Okely, Reinhard Ronner and Philip Meuer.

9. Two years after the organization of Bethlehem, Spangenberg arrived from Europe to assume the oversight of the American scene of operations, bringing with him a set of sixteen rules known as the "general plan." We quote the substance of only those which illustrate the Moravian attitude with reference to church extension:

2. "The itinerants are to have their rendezvous ordinarily at Bethlehem, but are to move about 'as a cloud before the wind of the Lord to fructify all places.'

8. "The Brethren in America should not call themselves Protestant or Lutheran or Moravian, but simply Evangelical Brethren and the Brethren's Church.

9. "It shall not be the purpose to make things 'Moravian' in carrying on the general evangelistic work; but if a church settlement—*Ortsgemeine*—comes into existence at Nazareth, it could be formed as a Moravian congregation *ceteris paribus*.

10. "The work among the Indians is to be prosecuted on apostolic principles without regard to denominationalism. .

12. "The Synod shall remain a general one, open to all servants of Christ who desire benefit from it for their denominations, or the salvation of their fellowmen. It shall be regarded as a Church of God in the Spirit with a general direction extending among people of all denominations." Cited by Levering, pp. 178-179.

Island and Long Island; Newport, Rhode Island; Broad Bay, Maine; Canajoharie, New York, and New York City. There were other more tenuous efforts. Two Brethren itinerated west of the Susquehanna during the winter of 1747. Evangelists visited Virginia and attempted religious work both among whites and Negro slaves.

The purchase by the Moravians of a 100,000 acre tract of land in North Carolina from Lord Granville in 1753 was the beginning of the establishment of the church there. In the same year a contingent of Brethren from Bethlehem, under the direction of Spangenberg, began the building of the first settlement, naming it Bethabara. It was intended to be developed into a settlement congregation as a southern counterpart of Bethlehem. A second settlement, Bethania, was begun three miles distant in 1759. Neither of these, however, developed into settlement congregations, and it was Salem (now Winston-Salem), founded in 1766, which was destined to be the center of Moravian life in the South. Bethabara and Bethania continue to exist as village congregations. Besides these three, three other churches came into being during the colonial era, Friedberg, Friedland and Hope. They are today thriving open country congregations.

During the colonial era Moravian congregations had two classes of adherents, communicant members and society members. Though similar to the European division between congregation and Diaspora members, it was different in that in America the society and the congregation were part of the same local group, forming an outer and an inner membership. In Europe the Diaspora societies were independent of the local Moravian church, except that some of the European societies were under the supervision of local boards of elders.

The arrangement was an adjustment to the absence of a state church at a time when the Moravians still did not regard themselves as an independent denomination free to proselytize. Since many of those in the societies in America did not have access to the ministrations of the churches of their background, the Moravian Church had to serve them in ways beyond those of the simple Diaspora fellowship. Hence American Moravian ministers baptized, buried, performed weddings, etc. outside the circle of

their own communicants, whereas in Europe the state church minister performed such services. It was this class of people so served, and yet who did not submit to the discipline of the congregational life of the Brethren, who formed the outer circle of membership in America.

Generally these society members comprised three classes:

(1) The youth of the congregation before being received into membership;

(2) Grown persons whose parents belong or belonged to the congregation, but who themselves are content with society membership;

(3) Those of other persuasions who are waiting to join the congregation.[10]

In a few situations, as for instance in New York City, where society members had easy access to their own churches, Moravian ministers did not perform church rites or administer the sacraments to them. Thus we find Peter Boehler addressing the society attached to the New York congregation in 1754:

> We wish that all Society members would continue in their respective churches as a salt, and have their children baptized by their own pastor, and partake of the Holy Communion in their particular Church. It is not our way to draw people from the Churches in which they have been brought up, and we earnestly wish that the ministers of other denominations would be friendly to us, for in this way they would not lose so many members. The baptism of children, excepting those of members of our Church, is not approved by our Synod.[11]

How this policy affected the growth of the church is easy to surmise. The statistics of membership, therefore, are not surprising. From the reports of ministers at a conference at Lititz in the year 1790 we excerpt the following concerning Pennsylvania and adjacent states:

Place	*Total number of persons affiliated*	*Communicants*
Graceham	150	60
Lancaster	330	72
Philadelphia	176	38
Oldmanscreek	168	37

10. "Extract of the Protocoll of the Provincial Conference held at Bethlehem from the 18th to the 30th October, 1802, with the labourers of the Pennsylvania and neighboring Brethren Congregations," in "Amerikanische Provincial Synoden," 1802, MS in Moravian Archives.

11. Cited by Stocker, pp. 35-36.

Staten Island	120	29
Gnadenhuetten	72	31
Emmaus	144	51
Schoeneck	144	66
Hebron	96	24
Heidelberg	56	16
York	155	38
Bethel	110	23
Mount Joy	77	No figure stated[12]

The reports of these ministers were none too optimistic concerning their churches. From reading the proceedings one gets the impression that one reason for the small number of communicants was the unwillingness of many to submit to the strict Moravian regulations. Particularly does there seem to have been difficulty in maintaining the practice of intimate personal conversation with individuals before admitting them to Holy Communion.[13]

Concerning membership statistics, it must also be remembered that at this stage the lot was being used by the Moravians to admit persons to full church membership. This practice not only barred many who eagerly sought admission, but also discouraged many from even trying to join the church. It is not surprising that despite the extensive evangelism of the Brethren in colonial America only eighteen of the present day 150 Moravian churches antedate the Revolution. The overwhelming majority of them are the products of a home mission era which began near the middle of the nineteenth century.

The concept of the Moravian Church as a Diaspora continued to influence strongly the policy in America during the first half

---

12. "Protocoll of the Conference at Lititz, May 7 and 8, 1790, with the Labourers of the Town and Country Congregations," as found in "Amerikanische Provincial Synoden," 1790, MS in the Moravian Archives. It is to be noted that this conference was for town and country congregations, which did not include Lititz, Bethlehem and Nazareth, the three settlement congregations.

13. This custom is known as "speaking" (sprechen), and is still practiced on the Moravian mission field. It is a Protestant equivalent of the Roman Catholic confessional.

14. This was the year of a General Synod at which American delegates demanded concessions in the direction of more home rule. Little was granted, but greater freedom in ministerial appointments to congregations was gained.

of the nineteenth century. The two kinds of membership continued for the first quarter of the century. The seat of government remained in Germany. Until 1818[14] the appointment of American Moravian ministers depended upon the approval of the central governing body, the Unity's Elders' Conference.

A few new churches were founded during this period, but not so much as a result of home mission aggressiveness as a result of members moving to new localities. During the first twenty years of the century two congregations came into being in southeastern Ohio. In 1799 members of the church at Gnadenhuetten, Pennsylvania, site of the Indian mission near Lehighton, moved to the scene of the Indian mission in Ohio. Out of this arose the present day town and congregation by that name. A related effort was the formation of the nearby Sharon Moravian Church in 1817. In 1830 the Moravian settlement and congregation of Hope, Indiana, was formed around a nucleus of settlers from Salem, North Carolina. In the Pocono region of Pennsylvania Germans who had become acquainted with the Moravian Diaspora in Europe organized a congregation in 1837. West Salem, founded in 1845 in southern Illinois, like Hope, Indiana, was the result of the migration of North Carolina Moravians. It was augmented by Diaspora Moravians from Germany in 1849. A short-lived home mission effort was launched among Germans in Camden Valley near the Vermont border in New York. In 1833 the Moravian congregation of New York City became concerned about the religious plight of German immigrants there, resulting in the formation of a home mission society. It was another twenty years before a second Moravian congregation came into being in that city.

Near the middle of the century the tide turned. The European outlook lost its grip, and the era of the modern Moravian Church in America began. The decade from 1847 to 1857 saw constitutional changes in the church which culminated in the autonomy of the respective provinces. The former date was the year of an American Moravian conference at which certain changes were outlined for presentation to general synod. The latter date is the year of the general synod at which the change was effected. Free to conduct its own affairs (except that it was still obligated

to assume its share of support of foreign missions) the American Moravian Church launched out on a program of home missions. The first tangible step was the organization of a local home missionary society in Bethlehem in 1848. The organization of a denominational home mission board followed in 1855.

The changing point of view is reflected in reports of proceedings at various church gatherings. Typical of the spirit of ferment is the report of the Western Ministers' Conference at Hope, Indiana, in June of 1853. In a unanimous declaration of principles the Conference places emphasis upon the need for home missions and deplores the lack of denominational aggressiveness. It censures the church for allowing the Diaspora point of view to shape American policy and blames this for the restricted influence of the American Moravians. The ministers speak as follows:

> The principle of the church in Europe that we are not a distinct church organization, but merely a society in the church and as such are not meant for the masses, was thus unhappily engrafted upon our young Zion here. Her activity has thereby been limited, her energies crippled. . . .
>
> Thus while other denominations have filled our young country with churches and preachers, we have for the last fifty years scarcely retained our own. Yes, and while our church in Germany through her Diaspora work, and in England, by awakening an interest in our extensive missionary effort, has existed to some purpose, it would be difficult for any one to point to the great good we have done in this country. In our opinion we declare freely, though sadly, the Brethren's Church in America has been comparatively speaking, pointless and fruitless. We therefore protect against the view of our Church so often put forth, that it is not a distinct and independent church, but rather a society within the Church. Political necessity has caused the assumption of that character in Europe; no such necessity exists here.[15]

Again we see the consciousness of home missions expressed in the pastor's report from Bethlehem for 1849:

> Our congregation has received accessions from without, partly by the addition of such residents of this place as applied for membership and were publicly recognized as members on the memorial day of the thirteenth of November, partly by the arrival of brethren and sisters immigrating from Germany and seeking a home in the bosom

15. *Moravian Miscellany*, IV, "Unanimous Declaration of Principles of the Western Ministers' Conference of the Moravian Church, assembled at Hope, Indiana, June 1853," p. 376.

> of this congregation. Others, not members in church fellowship, but in spiritual communion with our brethren in their German fatherland, have been settling at this place or in some of our western congregations while still other immigrants of the same description herefore connected with our Diaspora in Europe, are scattered over the Far West, [obviously this refers to what we now call the Middle West] destitute of those spiritual privileges, which they once possessed and so highly prize. The destitution of this latter class and the rapidly increasing population of the Western country in General, had attracted the attention of the Preparatory Provincial Conference convened here in the spring of 1847, to the important subject of Home Missions; and the preliminary resolution then adopted received the sanction of the General Synod of the Brethren's Unity assembled at Herrnhut in 1848.[16]

Paradoxically, as we see from these statements, the same Diaspora which discouraged home mission expansion served as the first points of contact when the change in thinking came. The growth of the Moravian Church in the Northern Province in the second half of the nineteenth century was almost exclusively among German and Scandinavian immigrants. Among the latter the effort was confined to a handful of communities in Wisconsin. Among the Germans congregations were established or attempted in the midwestern states of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Illinois and North Dakota. In the East congregations grew up among Germans in New York City and in Utica in the same state. Similar origins account for the churches in Elizabeth, Riverside, Palmyra and Egg Harbor in New Jersey. In nearly Philadelphia the Moravians failed in their efforts to establish a permanent work among Germans, but subsequently succeeded in having two more churches among older American stock in addition to the one Philadelphia congregation organized by Zinzendorf. Unsuccessful attempts were made to establish congregations among German immigrants in a few New England industrial centers.

Particularly was it true in the case of the Germans and Scandinavians of the Middle West and among German Russians of Alberta that Diaspora contact in the native land was the initiating factor in arousing Moravian interest in these people. Conspicuous too among the home missionaries of this era were Diaspora wor-

16. *Ibid.*, I, p. 106.

kers brought over from Europe.

The two outstanding pioneers among the Germans in Wisconsin were John Frederick Fett and John Gottlob Kaltenbrunn. Both of them were products of the Diaspora and had first been brought to America to work among their fellow countrymen in Philadelphia and New York City respectively. Among the Scandinavians were Nils Otto Tank and Andrew Michael Iverson. Both came to know the Moravian Church through the Diaspora in their native Norway. The former was of noble birth, had been educated in Germany for Moravian service, and had been a missionary in Surinam before coming to Wisconsin in 1849. In the East Philip H. Gapp[17] was called from Diaspora service in Germany to minister to German immigrants in Philadelphia and nearby areas in New Jersey.

The South, not receiving the flood of immigrants as did the North, was not subject to the same influences. The home mission awakening there came late in the century[18] and was more along the familiar American lines. The greater part of the growth of the Moravian Church South centers around the more recent development of the city of Winston-Salem and Forsyth County. There the familiar pattern was the establishment of a Sunday School which more often than not grew into a congregation. In the North with the strong German influence the pattern was the establishment of preaching places, some of which grew into organized congregations, many more of which did not.

An examination of the home mission activities, even in this second half of the nineteenth century, shows that the Diaspora background of some of the leaders influenced their strategy. Again and again the story is the same, many communities visited and services held, but with few permanent congregations resulting. At the very time when American Moravians were trying to shake off the Diaspora influence they were reflecting it.

---

17. The father of Bishop Samuel H. Gapp, and not to be confused with Philip H. Goepp, one of the administrators of the Bethlehem community a few years earlier.

18. Though in general this is true, there were several projects entered upon by the Southern province which had permanent results. Mt. Bethel, a mission work among mountaineers in southern Virginia, was begun in 1852. The two present day flourishing congregations of New Philadelphia and Kernersville were launched in 1848 and 1867 respectively.

The home mission work in Philadelphia and New York, for instance, appears from the reports to have been carried on more with immediate individual spiritual needs in mind than with church organization as a goal. Thus the home missionary Gapp in Philadelphia in his annual report for 1850 reveals the Diaspora point of view. The editor of the *Moravian Miscellany* prefaces the report as follows:

> Philip H. Gapp was appointed to labor as a colporteur and missionary amongst those Germans, who did not for various reasons belong to any of the German churches or attend the services of the house of God. He has thus been employed for the last seven months three days of each week, comforting the afflicted, warning the careless and unbelieving, instructing the ignorant, and doing all in his power to place the Gospel of Christ before those whom he visited, both by earnest conversation, and by distributing tracts, books and papers. His plan has been from the beginning to visit not a great number ,but to visit and converse as thoroughly as possible. On this account the number of families visited has not been so very large, but it is hoped that more good has been done than if too wide a circle had been traversed.[19]

Gapp himself says:

> I find a few families that are suspicious of me, because they think I am a Methodist, or a Baptist, against whom they are much prejudiced. I say everywhere, when I am asked, that I serve no party, but bring the Gospel of Christ.[20]

Some years later we find the same home missionary writing of his experiences in New Jersey. He relates his procedure as follows:

> I gave out an appointment to all in that neighborhood to meet with me in the evening, and as many as knew of it came. They expected that I would preach to them; but I preferred to make trial of the method pursued by our Diaspora Brethren in Germany. This was something quite new to them.

The rest of the account goes on to describe his conversation on personal spiritual matters with various individuals present. He concludes by saying: "I felt very much blessed withal; and remembrance of those former happy days in Germany, when the Diaspora brethren used to visit us, and keep such meetings for us, cam fresh to mind."[21]

---

19. *Moravian Miscellany*, 1851, pp. 53-54.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 54.
21. *The Moravian*, 1856, p. 11.

It is to be noted that after thirteen years the Moravians gave up the idea of establishing a church in Philadelphia among the Germans. Essentially the same story describes the situation in New York where Kaltenbrunn, Guenther and other ministered to German immigrants. From Guenther who later worked among Germans in Newark we note a report[22] made in 1857, for instance, which like Gapp's stresses the ministry to individual souls. An interesting detail of the work in Newark was the existence of a religious day school in charge of a former Diaspora worker from Basel.

The recording secretary of the Home Mission Society at Bethlehem writes in May of 1852 concerning work in Cleveland, Ohio:

> We had at the time of our last anniversary meeting a work commenced in the city of Cleveland, Ohio, on the plan of our Diaspora labors on the continent of Europe. Finding the plan of operation not to succeed here, the Board reluctantly relinquished this field of labor for a more favorable opportunity, to make another attempt to open here the "gate of righteousness" that we may go in to the praise of the Lord.[23]

As previously noted, Moravians from North Carolina established themselves in southern Illinois, to be augmented within a few years by Diaspora Moravians from Germany. Here existed consequently for over fifty years an English and a German congregation, which eventually merged in the year 1915. At first efforts were made to extend the work beyond the two congregations, but not in sufficiently aggressive fashion to achieve results. Martin Hauser writes in 1851:

> At Mt. Carmel and vicinity one half of the inhabitants are of German extraction, from different parts of Germany and from Northampton, Lehigh and Berks Counties, Pennsylvania. The German Lutherans have a beautiful church edifice, but their number is small and a considerable portion of their number have left the church and joined the Albright's people. I have preached several times in the Lutheran Church. Brother Michel has also visited and kept meetings there. But I see no necessity to labor at this place, as the people can hear the Gospel preached in German by the Lutherans and others, and in English by the Methodists and Presbyterians, and so I think it matters little by whom the Evil One is cast out.[24]

---

22. *The Moravian*, 1857, pp. 369-370.
23. *Moravian Miscellany*, 1852, p. 201.
24. *Moravian Miscellany*, 1851, pp. 212-213.

Illustrative of the work in Wisconsin begun in 1850 was the experience of the church in the Green Bay and Door County areas. No more indefatigable missionaries could be found than Iverson for the Scandinavians and Fett for the Germans. Their itinerant preaching and personal work took them over a wide territory, but left as its tangible results only a half dozen churches.

Stocker sums up Fett's work in these words:

> Although Fett's labors advanced the cause of Christ, they did not to any great extent increase the borders of the Moravian Church. His activities among the Germans in and about Green Bay were conducted upon principles resembling those upon which the Moravian Diaspora work in Europe are based. He faithfully performed every ministerial function, preaching the Gospel, administering the sacraments, instructing the children, and the like, but made no specific efforts to add such to the Moravian Church.[25]

The struggle to arouse the American Moravians to an enthusiastic support of home missions is evident from editorials, letters to the editor, articles, etc. in the official church periodical. Those church leaders who held to the American point of view reveal marked impatience not only with the lagging response to appeals for home mission support, but also with the Diaspora type of approach. Thus from an editorial we read:

> Now while we adopt the oft-repeated saying that our Church has been ordained to labor in the foreign missionary field, yet we feel persuaded that her American Province has a call from God equally important. It is to carry on the work of domestic missions with all her might; not in the sense of the continental home missions or Diaspora, but with the purpose of *church extension*. . . . Missionary labors, in this country, other than such as tend toward this goal cannot be successful. They will remain spiritless enterprises, will drag wearily through years, and effect comparatively little abiding good.[26]

This opinion was expressed about a decade after the home mission impulse had begun and is directed against the plan so far pursued in many places.

A somewhat more constructive attitude toward the Diaspora is expressed in *The Moravian* some years later in the form of a suggestion that a systematic effort be made to recruit Diaspora Moravians throughout Germany for settlement in America. The

25. Stocker, p. 57.
26. *The Moravian*, 1863, p. 94.

proposal takes note of the fact that many of such Diaspora members in Germany would have preferred membership in the Moravian Church if conditions had permitted. The editorial goes on to suggest that with a planned program these persons could be directed to those communities in America where there was a sufficient concentration of Moravians to make the organization of congregations feasible.[27] There is no record of such a proposal being followed up, but as we have already observed, the Diaspora background was the point of contact for the beginning of the home mission program. It is reasonable to suppose that the Moravians could have capitalized on this much more than they did.

As time went on, despite the limited resources of the church, home missions took on more impetus. The American spirit of growth affected the Moravian Church in widely scattered areas. The effort of the church to expand is shown in the trend toward decentralization. In 1869 the church in the North was subdivided into four districts to facilitate growth under more regional autonomy. In 1876 the Board of Church Extension was created with the avowed purpose of fostering the organization of new congregations. In 1913 the district sub-division of 1869 was altered in view of the subsequent growth of the church in the northern Middle West and in Alberta. Since 1913 the district divisions have consisted of the Eastern, the Western and the Canadian. The ensuing period has been characterized by a growing emphasis upon regional expansion.

That the Moravian Church in America did extricate itself from the handicap to growth imposed upon it by its forefathers is evident from a study of its present day congregations. There are in the United States and Canada 150 Moravian Churches. Only about thirty of these were in existence before 1850. Nearly fifty have been organized in the twentieth century. From 1860 to 1900 the membership almost tripled, growing from 8,187 to 22, 949. Since 1900 the membership was more than doubled with a present total of 46,327.

Yet the imprint of its heritage still lingers. The problem of

27. *The Moravian*, 1877, p. 34.

church extension is one which modern Moravians are deeply concerned about. But the resources of such a small denomination are a serious handicap. In few places is there a sufficient concentration of Moravians to form the nucleus of a new church. Therefore it is difficult for Moravians to keep pace with Americas' shifting population. In the face of this problem Moravians sometimes look to the Diaspora plan as a partial solution. Thus ran an editorial in the church's paper as recently as the year 1938:

> Why not an American Diaspora? It was estimated a few years ago.. . .that our church in America loses approximately a thousand persons a year through removals to communities where there are no Moravian Churches. Yet the concentration of Moravians in such communities is not enough to warrant the founding of such a congregation. . . .
>
> Would not a more practicable solution be an organized effort on the Diaspora plan? There are many cities in which there is a handful of Moravian families affiliated with other churches. Let them be permitted to retain these new affiliations, but also let them be encouraged to organize into Moravian societies. There might be such an arrangement as an associate membership in the Moravian Church, making it possible to retain traditional loyalties along with membership in another church.
>
> With a new continent opening up, the "church within a church" may have been Zinzendorf's big mistake two centuries ago. But a mistake is not necessarily corrected by trying the opposite policy under another set of conditions. Is the Moravian Church today in a position to carry on an aggressive policy of home church expansion? Hardly. But is it not in a position to launch an aggressive policy of the Diaspora type of expansion?[28]

It is in this spirit that in several areas there are Moravian fellowship societies without any plan of church organization. In our nation's capital, for instance, such a group has been meeting monthly for some years under the leadership of visiting ministers from both the Northern and Southern Provinces of the church. A similar society has been meeting for over thirty years in Wisconsin. More recently in southern California a fellowship group has been activated. Yet this limited existence of Moravian groups in America apart from organized congregations is in reality not a continuation of the Diaspora idea, but an expression of denominationalism. Its aim is to keep alive Moravian identity on the part of those who are in the process of losing it.

28. *The Moravian*, June 6, 1938, p. 1.

Generally speaking, the American Moravian Church today differs little from the average Protestant church in denominational consciousness. Its policy in recruiting membership, its interchurch relations, its participation in community life, are the common possession of other bodies also. In colonial American Moravians looked upon themselves as a community of Brethren of which experiential Christians of other churches could also be members. Therefore they were reluctant to organized churches. Today if Moravians are reluctant to organize new congregations, it is not for this reason, but because of the practical difficulties involved.

The chief effect of the Diaspora heritage in America is that it kept the Brethren from establishing themselves in sufficient numbers in the beginning. Consequently they were simply not in a position to take advantage of the challenge which later incoming immigrants presented. Moravian leadership was awake to the opportunity, but the financial resources and the personnel were not available in sufficient strength. By the time of the Moravian home mission awakening, other denominations, traditionally aggressive, had the resources and the momentum to take their churches to those in the line of westward advance. Also, the majority of Protestant Germans coming to America a century ago were Lutheran nationals, giving the Lutheran churches here a natural entry.

Considering these factors, we must concede the growth of the American Moravian Church and its development into the typical Protestant church which it is today as no small accomplishment. Though its total membership of approximately 46,000 puts it into the class of the lesser denominations, its wholehearted participation in the over-all program of Protestantism[29] lifts it out of the class of the sects. The Diaspora heritage of the Brethren has brought to the modern Moravian Church an outlook that makes it a welcome participant in the ecumenical movement of the present time.

29. The Moravian Church was a charter member of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America and more recently became a charter member of the National Council of Churches and is a charter member of the World Council of Churches.

CHAPTER X

Society Versus Ecclesia in Britain

In the tension between Diaspora and denomination the Moravians in Britain occupy a mid-way position between their Brethren in Germany and in America. That such should be the case is readily understandable. Though there was less pressure than in Germany for conformity there was not the degree of freedom enjoyed in the new world. In Britain there was an established church, and dissenters for many years had to have themselves licensed. The society or conventicle pattern was a familiar one. Because of the proximity to the Continent the German influence on Moravian policy was even stronger in Britain than in America. Zinzendorf himself had his headquarters in London at various times during the formative years of the church and was able personally to shape the early cource of events.

Representatives of the Moravian movement, namely, Wencelaus Neisser, John Toeltschig and David Nitschmann the Syndic, had been in England as early as 1728 to negotiate with the Society for the Promoting of Christian Knowledge. Zinzendorf's friendship with the Countess of Lippe-Schaumberg, one of the ladies of the English court and a Pietist, was the point of contact behind this visit. The opposition of the court preacher Ziegenhagen, a Hallensian Pietist, nullified these efforts. The next association with England was that made by Spangenberg in 1734-1735 in connection with his task as director of the Georgia enterprise of the Moravians. While the prospective colonists were in London awaiting their departure for Georgia pious fellow countrymen attended their religious services.

Two years later, in February of 1737, Zinzendorf himself came to London to consult with the Georgia trustees and to confer with Archbishop Potter of Canterbury about the Moravian episcopate.[1] During his stay of six weeks the devotions of the Count's household were attended by a number of Germans, the same ones

1. At the time Zinzendorf was contemplating taking the step of having himself consecrated as a Moravian bishop. The Archbishop of Canterbury was one of the several prominent men who encouraged him to do so. Another was Frederick William I of Prussia. Zinzendorf was consecrated on the following May 20 in Berlin by bishops Jablonski and Nitschmann.

who had previously been attracted to the services of the Georgia colonists. Prior to his departure from London Zinzendorf organized the fellowship at the request of its adherents into a society, the group agreeing to certain points to which ten persons attached their signatures. These rules were:

> (1) We will believe and practice only what is clearly expressed in the Holy Scriptures; and this we will believe and teach, whether it accords with our reason and ideas or not.
>
> (2) We will converse and associate with each other in a simple and childlike manner, and assemble once a week for that purpose; on which occasion we will merely pray, read the Scriptures, and edify ourselves from them, without bringing forward the smallest thing which might occasion dispute and variance.
>
> (3) We will sincerely speak what we think of each other, and not seek to conceal our faults, that no one may think more highly of each other than he deserves.
>
> (4) We will serve each other according to the gifts we possess, and quietly prepare ourselves for promoting the Lord's cause amongst others.
>
> (5) We will not interfere in any religious or ecclesiastical matters, but only attend to three simple things: —to become saved and sanctified by the blood of Jesus, and to love each other cordially.[2]

This little group formed part of the background for the more detailed organization a year later of the Fetter Lane Society. The Wesleys had come to know the Moravians enroute to and in Georgia. Through Charles Wesley, James Hutton, former Oxford student and now book seller, had become associated with the Moravian meetings. He also had a background of experience with the societies within the Anglican Church, one of which met in his father's house in London. But according to Hutton the societies of this time had lost their power. The Moravians brought an element of new spiritual life. Particularly inspiring to the meetings of the society in Hutton's home during the year 1737-1738 were the reports which John Wesley sent back from Georgia concerning the Moravians.

In April of 1738 the flame was further fanned when John Wesley returned to England, and Peter Boehler came there from Europe enroute to America. Accompanying Boehler were two other Moravian evangelists, George Schulius and Wencelaus

2. Spangenberg, pp. 228-229.

Neisser (the same man who had been in England in 1728). These Moravians with their teaching of "heart religion" were welcomed in the Anglican societies.

> Through Wesley [says Hutton] we soon made acquaintance with these brethren, and urged upon them to spend an hour for edification in our Society. Peter Boehler soon acquired some knowledge of the English language, and that which he could not deliver in English, was translated by a tailor named Viney, when present in *his* society; and Hutton, who understood Latin, did the same in *his* society. The commencement was very simple. They put questions to him, and Boehler answered the whole from the Holy Scriptures. To their astonishment, they saw for the first time, that he who believeth in Jesus hath everlasting life. This truth came to us so acceptably, that we obtained a sight of the only way of salvation. This Gospel was followed by an unspeakable grace and blessing after every discourse which Boehler or Neisser, who now also began to speak a little English, delivered. It was with indescribable astonishment and joy that we embraced the doctrine of the Saviour, of His merits and sufferings, of justification through faith in Him and of freedom, by it, from the dominion and guilt of sin.[3]

The effect upon the societies was somewhat disconcerting. There were many not in sympathy with the Moravians and at times feeling rose to a high pitch. Those following the Brethren's point of view referred to themselves as the awakened and regarded themselves as persecuted by the "Pelagians." Of course the high point for the historian in looking at this period of awakening among society members in England was the "heart-warming" experience of John Wesley on May 24, 1738, recorded in his *Journal* and frequently quoted:

> In the evening I went very unwillingly to a society in Aldersgate Street where one was reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans. About a quarter of nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone for salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and of death.

It was a few weeks prior to Wesley's experience that Boehler, on May 1, before he left for America had drawn up certain regulations for a new society composed of persons drawn to the

3. Daniel Benham, Memoirs of James Hutton, pp. 27-28.

Moravian teaching. The above mentioned disagreements with those who differed made such a move almost inevitable. Hutton was the real leader of the group and it was at his house that the meetings were first held. When his quarters became too small the meeting place was transferred to a chapel at 32 Fetter Lane, from which place the society took its name. The rules were formulated under the heading, "Orders of a Religious Society Meeting in Fetter Lane, in Obedience to the Command of God by St. James, and by the Advice of Peter Boehler, May 1, 1738."[4] The rules at this time apparently were more for the moral and religious guidance of the members than for the purpose of organization, and it was not until 1741 that the society had officers.

Both John and Charles Wesley were within a few weeks active members of the Fetter Lane Society. The former visited the Moravians in Holland, Wetteravia and Herrnhut and was favorably impressed.[5] Yet from the first there seemed to be tension between the Moravians and the future leader of the Methodists. Upon his return from the Continent Wesley tried to influence Hutton to separate from the Brethren. Nevertheless the Wesleys worked with their German fellow Christians for two years, the final separation not coming until July 20, 1740. The open air preaching of Wesley beginning in April of 1739 was with the full approval of the Fetter Lane Society. But while Wesley's activities and thinking soon began to pull him away from the Brethren, the society under Hutton's guidance drew toward closer fellowship with them. Hutton corresponded with Zinzendorf, appealing for Moravian evangelists. He even found his wife among the Brethren in Germany. Hutton introduced Moravian literature to English readers; he published a collection of Moravian hymns, a Moravian manual of doctrine, an English translation of a series of Zinzendorf's sermons delivered in

4. Benham, p. 29.

5. Wesley was accompanied on his visit to Germany by Benjamin Ingham. The latter was admitted to the Moravian communion service in Marienborn, but Wesley was not, on the grounds that he was a "homo perturbatus," a restless man. Whatever the real reason, we think Hutton's conjecture to be a plausible one. Hutton feels that the Brethren feared that if Wesley took communion with them he might be tempted to leave the Church of England. Cf. Hutton, p. 295.

Berlin.[6] By May of 1742 there were twenty German Moravians spreading the teachings of the Brethren in England. By that time Moravians and Methodists were well on their separate ways attempting to forward religious revival through the organization of societies within the framework of the Establishment.

The break between Wesley and the Moravians was due to a combination of factors.[7] Perhaps the most important was that of personality or temperament. Wesley was a man born to rule and in the Fetter Lane Society he was, according to the regulations, on the same plane as the humblest member. At the same time the majority consciously or unconsciously looked up to Zinzendorf. This clash in personality made it easier to magnify theological differences. The methodical Wesley stressed the possibility of attaining sinless perfection. The Brethren, following Luther, emphasized the state of grace. Wesley thrilled to the response of huge crowds. Moravians distrusted this kind of evangelism. There is too the difference of nationality. Moravianism, international as it may have become geographically, has always had a strong German flavor.

It was over four years from the founding of the Fetter Lane Society to its organization as a Moravian congregation in November of 1742. A year before the latter event the members had already organized a foreign mission society in August of 1741 under the name "Society for the Furtherance of the Gospel." It continues today as the mission arm of the British Moravian Church.

Another event of significance for the future took place on September 16, 1741, namely, a change in the form of Moravian church government. A conference of leaders, including Zinzendorf and Spangenberg, following the resignation of Leonard Dober as Chief Elder, declared the transfer of the office to the Saviour Himself.[8] Henceforth the authority was to be vested in

6. These sermons known as *Berlinischer Reden* attracted wide attention. They are invaluable for an understanding of Zinzendorf's theology.

7. For a good analysis of the break between Wesley and the Moravians see Monsignor Knox's chapter entitled "The Parting of Friends (1)," in *Enthusiasm*, pp. 459-492.

8. This event was announced to the congregations on the Continent on November 13, and ever since November 13 is one of the important festival days in the Moravian church calendar.

a general conference, or collegiate board of twelve members whose residence was to be in Marienborn. Of course this meant that the work in England too would be under this board in Germany.

In the meantime both Moravians and Methodists had been carrying on extensive evangelistic work in Yorkshire since 1739. Technically it was not organized as Moravian work, though several Moravian preachers were among the workers. Benjamin Ingham, an Anglican clergyman who never did join the Moravian Church, was the main figure at this time. Within three years he had formed about fifty societies, with perhaps as many as 2000 adherents. Then in May of 1742 Ingham felt that the work was getting beyond him and appealed to the Moravians to take over his societies. This, under Spangenberg's direction, was done, and the Moravian work in England received a great impetus. Prior to this the above mentioned London Conference of 1741 had declared the Yorkshire district to be the true sphere of the Brethren's labors in England, so Ingham's request received a cordial welcome. In arranging for the taking over of the Yorkshire project Spangenberg organized some of the Fetter Lane members into a "Yorkshire Congregation," a sort of pilgrim band,[9] and on July 6 they left London for their field of labor.

All this preceded the Fetter Lane Society itself becoming a congregation. Even after its congregational organization its status is somewhat perplexing. One of the incentives to organization was the need for legal recognition, for the law required dissenters to be licensed. Yet the society was made up largely of Anglicans who did not wish to be classed as dissenters. But the Moravians had already suffered at the hands of mobs and wished to protect themselves. (Their detractors did not regard them as members in good standing of the Church of England and regarded them as unlicensed dissenters.) Archbishop Potter advised Spangenberg that a license was unnecessary, since the Brethren consisted of foreign Protestants and English churchmen.[10] Nevertheless, the license was taken out in Sep-

9. This was similar to the pilgrim congregation, the itinerant portion of the congregation in Bethlehem, as described in the previous chapter.
10. Benham, p. 79.

tember under the name "Moravian Brethren, formerly of the Anglican Communion." Zinzendorf, hearing of this in America, wrote his protest jointly with Bishop David Nitschmann and brought it back to England in February of 1743 for deposit in the archives of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

> To his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. David and Nicholaus, Bishops of the Church of the Brethren,
>
> Wish much health,—As soon as we heard that certain holy men in your metropolitan city, endued by God with singular gifts, had received license for preaching the word of God from the chief magistrates and patrons of the city, under this title: "Moravians so called, formerly of the English Communion," we must ingeniously own that it caused in us the greatest perplexity. And although the persons distinguished by this title were well known to us, and we admired and respected them for their integrity of heart and excellent gifts with which our Lord had endowed them; yet we can by no means consent to their taking upon them the title of *Moravian*, as preferable to any other common denomination. Our church will never ask for the rights of dissenters; neither (since she is the most ancient of the Protestant churches, if not their common mother) could she take upon her the name of orthodox, apostolical and episcopal without great folly. And although we may easily believe that the best of men, being ignorant of ecclesiastical history, and finding themselves assisted in the ways of the Lord by the labors of the Brethren, might therefore agree to adopt both the name and fortune—which truly Christian simplicity herein we neither justify nor condemn; yet we are desirous to have our express protestations set forth in this letter, properly deposited in the paternal hands of the Archbishop. As soon as an opportunity more favorable to the tranquility of the Brethren shall happen, we are desirous that it may be thence again obtained and either made known to the public, or in private, to those of each party according as it best comports with propriety and candour.
>
> Given at Philadelphia, 19th day of November, 1742.[11]

The Count was doing his best at this stage to keep the Moravians from becoming dissenters, not only in England, but elsewhere. He was still hopeful for union in Pennsylvania. His tropus doctrine was in full bloom. One of his first acts upon his return to Germany in 1743 was to protest special concessions granted to the Brethren in his absence in Silesia. He tried but failed to have the Brethren there brought under the Lutheran

11. Benham, footnote, p. 80.

consistory. In fact so upset was Zinzendorf that he practically set aside the powers of the General Conference, declaring that the members of it had exceeded their authority. For the next decade or so the government of the Moravian Church was more under the personal direction of Zinzendorf than under the General Conference.

A little more than a month following the taking out of the license the Fetter Lane Society on November 10, 1742, became a congregation. Organization was according to the then Moravian pattern with choirs, choir elders, wardens, admonitors, censors, servants and sick waiters. There were seventy-two members in this first English Moravian Church.[12]

Yet Fetter Lane, in the minds of its English members at least, still had the status of a society. Addison gives an excellent summary of what was undoubtedly their frame of mind at the time:

> It is important that we, at any rate, should note the precise character of the change which had come upon the Fetter Lane Society. That association had neither vanished into thin air nor become merged in the Renewed Unitas. All its members save the 72, continued in the same position as was enjoyed by the members not welcoming the ministrations of the Moravian "laborers," while both the 72 and such of Hutton's friends as were not of that group continued to regard themselves as loyal churchmen, and rigorously guarded themselves against schism. . . .
>
> It is perfectly clear that this first London (Moravian) congregation, including men like Hutton, Holland and Gambold, rejected any suggestion that their new alignment implied separation; they were eager to evangelize, reluctant to proselytize; they even appealed to Anglican clergy to undertake the spiritual charge of their converts. No doubt, from one viewpoint it is correct to describe this as a "suicidal" policy; from these men's own standpoint, on the contrary, it was the one natural and logically defensible policy, *since it was only because they had so conceived the task of the Unitas Fratrum in England that they had ever ventured within the circle of its fellowship.*[13]

The events of the next decade bear out this appraisal. The activity of the Brethren continued largely along society lines.

---

12. Hutton, p. 303 and Benham, p. 87ff.
13. William George Addison, *The Renewed Church of the United Brethren*, pp. 90:91.

Fulneck (the center of the Yorkshire work) and Fetter Lane remained the only two congregations until 1745, the former in the course of the decade becoming a settlement congregation after the style of Herrnhut. With scores of preaching places and with thousands of followers only a handful of congregations were planted.

Zinzendorf, Hutton and others continued to take the position that since the Church of England and the Moravian Church were sister Episcopal churches, a dual membership was possible. On August 2, 1745, the Brethren had printed in the *Daily Advertiser* a declaration of principles to explain their position to the public under the heading "Declaration of the Societies in England Joining the Brethren." This declaration reviews the Brethren' position with reference to those who sought to join them, in an attempt to correct the distorted picture of them circulated by the Wesley and Whitefield followers. It reveals clearly the Brethren's reluctance to proselyte and gives illustrations from Holland, Germany and America of their keeping awakened persons in their respective state churches. For the English scene they express themselves in the declaration as follows:

> We wish for nothing more than that some time or other there might be some bishop or parish minister found of the English Church, to whom with convenience, and to the good liking of all sides, we could deliver the care of those persons of the English Church who have given themselves to our care.[14]

On June 6, 1749, the Moravian Church was recognized by act of Parliament as an "Ancient Episcopal Church," in response to a petition initiated by Zinzendorf asking for exemption from taking oaths and bearing arms on the part of the Brethren. Actually these two concessions were not sought so much as ends in themselves, as means to secure legal recognition for the church, particularly to facilitate mission work in British possessions. For the Moravians to ask merely for legal recognition without something specific was not good strategy.[15] In granting the concessions asked for, Parliament did so in view of the evidence presented that the Moravians were members of an historic church organized on the Episcopal plan.

14. Benham, p. 182.
15. Addison, p. 100.

It might be concluded that this act definitely marked a point of departure for the Moravians in England. Actually this was not the case. The Act of Parliament in Zinzendorf's thinking, and consequently in the ensuing Moravian policy did not mean a change in status. To him it meant that his tropus idea now had the sanction of the state. Hutton[16] reminds us of the contradiction which still existed. Though declared by act of Parliament as constituting an Episcopal church, and with their doctrine recognized as in agreement with the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Moravians continued to be treated as dissenters. They still had their churches licensed as places of worship for Protestant dissenters. The uncertainty of the Moravian position was not much different from that existing at the time of the organization of the Fetter Lane Society into a congregation.

However, this was not as inconsistent as its theoretical consideration makes it appear. The Brethren continued to have their places of worship licensed out of practical considerations. A letter addressed to the Archbishop of York in 1745 explains their action. Though written before 1749, it reflects what continued to be their thinking after the Act of Parliament. We quote in part:

> Disturbances are at all times odius to us, and much more in these unhappy times; and if our Places remain unlicensed the Blaim of all these disturbances would be laid at our door, tho' we should only be the persons who were *disturbed*.
>
> We and our Brethren ev'ry where have a respect for the laws as for the Commands of Parents under God; and our hearts are subjected to the Magistrates willingly; and tho' if it had been left to our choice, we had still continued unlicensed (because to the taking out of the License it is required that we give ourselves the name of Dissenters) yet rather than not to act according to the Laws, or be even innocently the occasion of Disturbances, we chuse to be licensed.[17]

Further elaboration is unnecessary to show how the Diaspora ideal was the cominant motive in the founding of the Moravian Church in the British Isles. What has been the result of this on the subsequent history of the Moravians? A comparison of the

16. *History of the Moravian Church*, p. 345.
17. Herrnhut MSS., R. 13, A, cited by Addison pp. 173-174.

extent of early Moravian work with the size of the British Moravian Church today gives us the answer. The British Province today numbers forty-two congregations, of which six are in Ireland and the others all in England. Total membership is only approximately thirty-five hundred.[18] The church maintains three boarding schools with a combined enrollment of about 600, including day students who also attend. Apart from a few societies supporting Bible readers in Ireland[19] there is no equivalent of the German Diaspora, though many non-Moravians in the British Isles take an active interest in Moravian missions. Most conspicuous of these interested friends are members of the "London Association in Aid of Moravian Missions," founded in 1817, and contributing an average of about five thousand pounds annually to the mission cause. This, together with some generous legacies that have been left to the Moravians by a few wealthy members, explains why the British Moravians are able to bear such a proportionately large share of mission work. The membership of the churches of the mission field under British administration is actually *sixty times larger than the membership of the British home churches.*[20] Many Englishmen regard the Moravian Church primarily as a missionary society and support it as such.

---

18. *Moravian Daily Texts*, 1950, Appendix, p. 251.

19. In 1829 there was organized "The United Brethren's Society for Propagating the Gospel in Ireland," which has had a continued existence ever since. In reality it is a religious tract society, with about six itinerants on its staff who devote most of their time to the reading and distribution of the Scriptures and to personal religious work. The first item in their instructions describes their program: "You are called after the example of Christ and his Apostles, to propagate the Gospel, by going about from village to village, in the district appointed for you, visiting the Poor in their cottages, for the purpose of reading the Holy Scriptures, conversing on spiritual subjects and engaging with them in prayer. Where it can conveniently be done, you may collect the inmates of some neighboring cottages into one place; but you are not to deliver public sermons," from the *Second Report of the United Brethren's Society for Propagating the Gospel in Ireland, for the Year 1830-31*, Bradford, p. 6.

20. This proportion is misleading in that it conveys the impression that the Moravians in Britain are more mission minded than Moravians elsewhere. It is largely a matter of administration. When the various mission fields were apportioned administratively among the various provinces of the church after World War I, the British Moravians were given a heavier share because of their invested funds, because so much of the mission work was in British territory. Much of the personnel for the fields administered from England comes from the Continent.

Membership of the churches in Britain has remained practically stationary for the past one hundred years, meaning in terms of population increase a marked relative decline. How does this compare to Moravian beginnings? We have already noted the fifty societies and twelve hundred adherents turned over to the Moravians in Yorkshire by Benjamin Ingham in 1742. Even more striking is the case of John Cennick. An Englishman of Bohemian ancestry, who when still in his teens was one of the first open air Methodist preachers. With great success he worked at various times under both Wesley and Whitefield, as well as more or less independently. In 1745 he broke with the two evangelists and threw in his lot with the Moravians, joining their membership, something which Ingham never did. At the same time he asked the Moravians to take over his societies in Wiltshire. The following year he went to Ireland where he preached with equally successful results, first in and around Dublin, and then in the Belfast area in the north.

Cennick's career was brief, for he died in 1755 at the age of thirty-seven. Yet in that short time he had built ten chapels and organized two-hundred and twenty societies.[21] Of all the Moravian evangelists Cennick's methods were most like those of the Methodists. Everywhere he preached he attracted great crowds, and his meetings were frequently accompanied by the excitement and physical manifestations common to mass revivalism.

Moravian leadership organized relatively few of Cennick's societies into congregations. Of the forty-two existing British Moravian churches eleven have their origin in the evangelistic labors of Cennick. In the case of Cennick, however, we cannot ascribe to Moravian policy alone the relative impermanence of his work. At the time the church was passing through a severe financial crisis, making it impossible to give aid to the founding of congregations. Also, the early death of Cennick dealt a blow to work of a type built around a personality.

---

21. Most of these could hardly be called organized societies, being little more than audiences. Though Moravian historians refer to them as societies, only a fraction seem to have formally organized.

In the congregations that did arise there was usually a long period of waiting between the beginning as a society and organization as a congregation. Bristol, Kingswood, Bath, Malmesbury, Devenport, are illustrative; all were the scene of Cennick's preaching as early as 1745. The respective dates for the founding of congregations in these places are 1755, 1757, 1765, 1770 and 1771.[22]

The death of Zinzendorf in 1760 presented the Moravians in England with the same problems as elsewhere. With the church having leaned so heavily upon the Count, the latter part of the eighteenth century was one of constitutional readjustment. In this process conservatism and centralization were the prevailing notes. This, of course, meant that the Diaspora method continued to hold sway. In England the term "United Flocks" was used, but the idea was the same.

Toward the end of the careers of the two Wesleys the Methodists and Moravians seemed to be drawing together, and there were even overtures of union from the former. It was the time in Methodism when a definite break with the Church of England was impending, the break in the case of the Methodists in America having already occurred with the ordination of Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury for service in the new world. The Methodists in England were concerned about organization and clerical orders and were exploring the possibility of finding a solution through taking advantage of the parliamentary recognition as an episcopal church which the Moravian already enjoyed.

Whatever may have been the details of these negotiations is beyond the scope of our study, but in at least one aspect the affair is pertinent. One of the chief objections raised by some of the Moravians is that the Moravian-Methodist combination would become a separate church and destroy the status of the Brethren as a Diaspora. Especially revealing is an exchange of letters between two prominent Moravian officials, Benjamin

22. Hutton, p. 323.

LaTrobe and John Loretz,[23] in the years 1785-1786. The fact that these men deplore the departure from the Diaspora method is an indication that Moravians were divided on the subject. Peter Boehler, for instance, is spoken of thus: "Our late dear Brother Boehler was a church man and came determined to make an end of the Diaspora."[24] LaTrobe complains to Loretz that those in favor of church extension had persuaded many Moravians to change their minds after they had agreed to the resolutions of both a general and a provincial Synod to adhere to the Diaspora plan. He feels that Moravian influence is not what it might have been had the Brethren been true to their first principles. (Just the reverse of what most present day Moravians in England and America believe).

Since Loretz at the time of the correspondence was a member of the Unity's Elders' Conference, he undoubtedly would reflect the official Moravian position on the question. Replying to LaTrobe he writes as follows under date of February 17, 1786:

> We must return to our first principles and to the task which our Lord has given us and we see by your letter that you are in accord with us. We have wandered from the plan of the Ordinary. We have given a promise to Parliament and to the Archbishop to retain the awakened within the Anglican Church. We have not done that but we have closed the door for us to the Church of England by our mistakes. We have nothing else to do than to preach the Word of the Cross. That was the original idea of our work in England. We cannot deny that it was a principle that a member of the Church of England should not enter into the Moravian Church before he had left the Church of England. Our colleagues in England had not the courage [Muth] to work upon the Diaspora plan—for which we can only ask the Lord's forgiveness. He can bring good from our mistakes.[25]

---

23. LaTrobe was general superintendent of all of the Brethren's work in England from 1765 to 1781. He was an ardent exponent of Zinzendorf's Diaspora policy. Hutton blames him for being one of those largely responsible for a "suicidal" policy.

Loretz as "Senior Civilis" of the Moravian Church had the important task of representing the church in negotiations with civil governments. His office required extensive travel. He too was an exponent of the Zinzendorfian policy.

24. Addison, p. 202. Boehler, besides having an important part of the establishment of the church in America, rendered similar service in England.

25. Addison, pp. 213-214.

Regardless of how strong the sentiment for denominational expansion was among the Moravians in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, the fact remains that it was not carried out. The centralizing policy was too great an obstacle to overcome, especially in view of the fact that a heavy burden of debt rested upon the church during this period. Without outside help the potential congregations could not launch out, even had they been fee to do so. By this time, too, the enthusiasm of the evangelical revival as a whole had begun to wane. Not only did the societies begin to fall apart, but also the impulse for church growth was gone too. Those who had not capitalized by organizing well during the height of the revival now found themselves losing ground.

Moravianism, with its roots in Pietism, exhibited its inherently conservative nature in the face of debt and in the face of disturbances preceding, during and after the Napoleonic era. The Moravians preferred to foster religious life in their settlement congregations, to maintain their Christian schools, and to carry on their program of foreign missions. Likewise as the free religious life the Moravians stood for became more and more the common possession of the English nation, Moravianism lost some of its selling points. There was no longer any need to look to a group of Germans for something that could be found in other groups with a more English complexion. After the societies had pretty well disappeared from the scene the British Moravians, like the Americans, found themselves to be a church, but so small that the means for expansion were seriously restricted. Hutton says, "At no period had the Brethren a grander opportunity of extending their borders than during the last quarter of the eighteenth century."[26] He proceeds to reinforce his statement by listing the extensive work of the Brethren at the time in Yorkshire, Cheshire, the Midlands, Bedfordshire, Wales, in Scotland around Ayr, in the West of England, in North Ireland.

In view of the factors previously mentioned it is probably more correct to say that the opportunity for Moravian expansion had already slipped away before this. The status of the Moravian

26. *History of the Moravian Church*, p. 442.

Church in England was determined within the first twenty years, when both the Moravian movement and the evangelical revival were in their most formative years. For the Moravian Church to have grown extensively in England it would have had to cease being "Moravian," that is, it would to have had to abandon its close ties with the Continent, its Pietism and its foreign mission emphasis.

The psychology of the British Moravian Church in the past century has been essentially the same as that of the American church. The leadership has had the will to enlarge the borders of the denomination, but has found it difficult to escape from the heritage of a delayed start. With all of their extensive evangelism in the eighteenth century the British Moravians had less than twenty organized congregations by 1775. Between this date and the end of the century they organized only two more churches. Since then the number of churches has doubled, but not the membership, the newer churches together with the older ones remaining pitifully small.

Regarding relations with other churches the Moravians in England stand as a sort of half-way house between the Anglican and the free churches. It is this anomolous position which is perhaps one of their weaknesses. There is concern in Moravian circles as to whether the Brethren in Britain can maintain an independent existence much longer. The ultimate decision concerning the course of future Moravian action in England will probably not come from the Moravians themselves, but will be determined by the forces operating upon the total church situation there.

CHAPTER XI

The Moravians in Post-War Germany

The Moravian Church in post-war Germany is to a great extent a refugee church with both people and entire congregations uprooted. In order to get a proper picture of the current status of the Diaspora we must examine the church as a whole. In a sense the church itself has become a Diaspora in that it is composed of a scattered membership living apart from its congregations and being served as best as possible by pastors in temporarily itinerant fashion.

Moravians had only twenty-five congregations before the war. Six of these in the Eastern Zone, four of them among the oldest and strongest, were completely destroyed and deserted.[1] All of the members were either expelled or fled of their own accord to other parts of Germany. Some of the refugees found homes among members of the congregations in the Western Zone, particularly at Bad Boll, Hamburg, Koenigsfeld, and Neuwied. Many more were forced to scatter throughout the country within both the Eastern and Western Zones and to live as non-resident members.[2] At the end of 1947 the German Moravian Church reported 11,234 members[3] in twenty congregations. Of these 5,025 were resident members, and 6,209 were non-residents and refugees. Herrnhut was heavily damaged in the closing days of the war, losing its church and other historic buildings. Fortunately its archives escaped destruction. Other congregations suffered serious property damages. The church also lost most of its business and industrial establishments. Most of its schools were forced to close.

Since the real Diaspora work of the church was located in the Eastern Zone, most of it was completely disrupted. Diaspora

---

1. Hartmut Beck, "The Moravian Refugees in Germany," an article in *The Moravian*, May 27, 1950, p. 3. The abandoned congregations are Breslau, Hausdorf, Gnadenberg, Gnadenfrei, Gnadenfeld, and Neusalz.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 3.

3. Heinz Renkewitz, *Die Bruedergemeine ihr Auftrag und Ihre Gestalt*, p. 43. It is stated above that the church had twenty-five congregations before the war and that six were destroyed. To the remaining nineteen the refugee congregation of Neu Gnadenfeld has been added.

members in the Warthe and Netze Bruch regions in Germany and in western Poland being practically all of German stock, became displaced persons. Many of them are now in Berlin. The meeting halls and other property of these Diaspora societies, like the church buildings in the congregations, were for the most part destroyed or lost to the church through confiscation. It is estimated that the German Moravian Church as a whole lost nine-tenths of its property—churches, schools, business establishments, real estate, factories.[4]

In the midst of these adversities the Moravians have found that their accumulated Diaspora experience stands them in good stead, for the methods called for in ministering to their constituency are in line with their methods through the years. In 1947 the District Synods in the two respective zones made arrangements to meet the conditions to some degree. The country was divided into districts, each of them centering around a local Moravian congregation. Within each of these areas the Moravians were made members of that parish and the pastor was made responsible for them. His is truly an itinerant ministry. The pastor at Neuwied, for instance, in a two-year period held thirty-five meetings at twelve different places[5] in addition to his regular services. Of course, in between pastoral ministrations lay leaders also held meetings.

In communities with a sufficient number of Moravians a group is organized. This might be called, in terminology popular in our time, a cell group where meetings take place and members and friends of the Moravian Church meet one another. Besides the Moravians in attendance there are readers of the *Daily Texts*, supporters of Moravian missions, alumni of the Brethren's schools. These gatherings take the form long familiar in Diaspora circles. News is shared from Moravian congregations, from the mission fields, from the educational institutions. The

4. *Ibid.*, p. 44. The Moravian Church in Germany has up to the present time continued to operate business and industrial establishments on a proportionately large scale. One of its major industrial activities was in the field of textiles.

5. ————Gaertner, *Betreuung unserer in der Zerstreuungwohnenden Mitglieder der Bruedergemeine*, a pamphlet published by the German Moravian Church reviewing highlights of a synod held at Bad Boll in May of 1949.

Moravian ecumenical mindedness strongly reveals itself, for the leaders urge cooperation with the local churches of other denominations in which the refugee Moravians worship. The value of these meetings does not stop at such intangibles as spiritual and social uplift. They serve as centers of distribution to the needy of food and clothing and for contacts leading to possible new employment.

But since the Moravian meetings are not sufficient to provide for the spiritual needs of the refugees, most of the Brethren join local congregations of other churches where they live. There they assist in Sunday School work, are active in women's groups, in counselling other refugees and in youth activities. An interesting arrangement of dual church membership has been worked out in some cases, both the local church and the Moravian Church recognizing the displaced person as a full member.

Special effort is made to keep the scattered members in touch with that Moravian congregation which is the center for their particular area. From time to time they gather there for retreats, rally days, mission or Bible weeks. They also are encouraged to attend Moravian services in the congregations at festival seasons of the church year, at which time lodging and food are offered at very nominal prices, if anything is charged at all. Some of the Moravian churches in such a central location have published directories with the names and addresses of all the members of their district. This enables people to locate their nearest Moravian neighbors and to visit one another when they travel. In the Eastern Zone an individual, herself a displaced person, is in charge of the travel service which serves the members of the abandoned congregations in that area.

With particular reference to the actual Diaspora itself, the post-war situation has focused new attention upon it. In Switzerland, Holland, Denmark and Sweden the work is continued along the lines described for these countries in preceding pages. Recognizing the blow which the church in Germany has suffered, the Diaspora Moravians in the above countries have rallied to the support of Moravian projects in an encouraging fashion. The annual mission festivals in Switzerland and Holland have taken on new vigor.

Particularly illustrative is the work of the Zeist Mission Society in the latter country, which at the mission festival on September 20, 1950, reported an income of about 300,000 florins for the preceding year. This amount received from friends throughout all Holland was twice the amount the officers in setting up their budget had expected to receive. Fifty thousand friends who contribute a nominal sum each quarter have been enrolled. In the same period of time a native preacher from Surinam had raised 50,000 florins by his mission lectures in the Netherlands, sometimes as high as 1000 in an evening. The following is an eye-witness account of the festival:

> The day before the mission festival a small number of Moravians had met in the evening for a prayer meeting to ask the Lord's blessing for the next day. The same day at 8 P.M. a concert was held for the benefit of the mission hospital at Knabel. (For a year the hospital has also been receiving financial aid from the Surinam government.) The church auditorium had been beautifully decorated for the occasion with Dutch flowers and ivy.
>
> Wednesday, September 20, at 11 A.M. the annual business meeting of the Zeist Mission Society was held there. For lunch members of the Moravian Church in Zeist, non-resident members and friends of the mission united for a fellowship meal in the small meeting hall of the Sisters' House.
>
> At 3 P.M. there was a big lovefeast in the church during which Brother Legene, the Rev. A. A. Breeveld (native minister from Surinam), Miss A. A. Groenewegen (teacher from Surinam), and Dr. H. Berkhof (guest speaker) addressed the congregation.
>
> In the evening meeting the Rev. B. D. Schmenk, the guest speaker, spoke on the prophetic aspects of the times in which we live and directed the thoughts of the congregation towards the end of God's history in this world. Finally, Brother Bielke, former superintendent of the mission field of Surinam, closed this last meeting of the day with a review of the mission festival and led the congregation in prayer.
>
> The income of the bazaar that had been run all day exceeded that of the past year by far. At the end of the day the brass band played chorales in front of the church in praise and thanksgiving to God.[6]

6. Hartmut Beck, "Miracles During the Past Year," an article in *The Moravian*, October 28, 1950, p. 7.

In Denmark in two winter campaigns during 1946 and 1949 nearly 6000 non-Moravians responded to appeals to help support Moravian missions by regular contributions.[7] The Swiss and Swedish Diaspora societies at present are carrying the burden of support for Moravian missions in South and East Africa.

In Germany itself the number of mission agents soliciting the support of non-Moravians averages about twenty, about the same as the number of pastors in established Moravian congregations. With more men than usual having had to be recalled recently from the foreign field, a larger than normal proportion of these agents are former missionaries.

With reference to the displaced Diaspora members, two lines of development are in prospect, to continue working among some of them in traditional Diaspora fashion, and to organize some of them into Moravian congregations. In line with the first, three Brethren have recently been appointed to extend the Diaspora work in the Western Zone. A revival, therefore, of the "Gemeinschaftspflege" is in prospect in territory where the Diaspora had become largely mission society work. In line with the second prospect is the expressed desire for new Moravian congregations. Plans are being considered, for instance, to organize the refugees in Berlin into a second congregation in that city. Elsewhere, wherever there is a sufficient concentration of Moravians there seems to be the impulse to organize a congregation, where in previous generations this usually would not have been the case.

A conspicuous work of reconstruction is being done in the establishment of a new Moravian congregation in the northwestern corner of Germany near the Netherlands border. It gives promise of becoming an important Moravian center similar to the larger old settlement congregations. It is called Neu Gnadenfeld[8] in remembrance of the destroyed Moravian village of

7. Hartmut Beck, "An Inter-Church Mission Society," an article in *The Moravian*, June 17, 1950, p. 7.

8. The information on Neu Gnadenfeld was secured from several sources: from Dr. F. P. Stocker, president of the Provincial Elders' Conference of the Moravian Church in America, who visited the settlement and other Moravian

Gnadenfeld in Silesia, from where many of the refugees have come.

The place, originally named Alexisdorf, was a work camp for German youth before the war. During the war it was used as a camp for Russian prisoners, a grim reminder of which is the adjacent Russian cemetery. Near the end of the war the prisoners were moved and the camp stood vacant. Soon after, refugees from Moravian congregations and Diaspora societies in Poland and Eastern Germany secured permission to occupy it.

The first group of persons, numbering about 200, arrived in the spring of 1945. Since then the number of members of the community has grown to about 1000. Within the past five year period a miracle of rehabilitation has been accomplished. The settlement, lying on a barren, treeless, sandy plain, gave little promise of supporting many people. Undaunted, the church authorities purchased several hundred acres of this unproductive land and by expensive fertilizing and the bringing up of deep sub-soil to the surface with specialized machinery, have transformed a sizeable area into productivity.

Already the village is producing much of its own food and preparing for the establishment of small industries.[9] Through the Church World Service organization and generous friends in various countries a barracks type church, a school, a few homes, and other buildings have been erected. Plans have been drawn for an entirely new Moravian community with the church located in the center of the village. It is hoped that eventually Neu Gnadenfeld may rival traditional settlements that have distinguished Moravian life at its best for more than two centuries. Herrnhut was at the time of its founding a community of refugees. The spirit of Neu Gnadenfeld is the spirit of eighteenth century Herrnhut brought up to date.

---

communities in the summer of 1948, prior to his attendance at the organizational meeting of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam; from Dr. Heinz Renkewitz, cited in previous pages; and from items in Moravian periodicals from time to time.

9. During 1950 the settlement was in the process of securing a textile factory and another for the manufacture of tobacco products.

CHAPTER XII

Interpretation and Summary

A church numbering at its peak only about 10,000 communicant members in Europe would ordinarily not be expected to make much of an impression on the world around it. Yet Zinzendorf and his little band of Moravians have made a deep impression. That they were pioneers in the Protestant foreign mission movement is generally recognized. Less known, even to many familiar with Moravian missions, is the profound influence of the Brethren upon the whole Protestant community in the European homeland through their Diaspora societies. These fostered a warm piety of which foreign missions happen to be just one of the more conspicuous fruits.

The evidence points to at least five specific areas in which the Moravian contribution is clearly recognized:
(1) its leavening influence upon the various Protestant state churches, (2) its part in the rise of the foreign mission movement, (3) its part in the rise of inner missions on the Continent, (4) its influence in the direction of Protestant unity, (5) its influence upon the whole Romantic movement beyond the realm of religion.

I. Pietism, having recovered for European Protestantism much of the individualism and inwardness of the original Lutheran revolt, had by the time of the rise of the Renewed Moravian Church itself become formalized and stiff. It remained for Zinzendorf and his Herrnhuters to bring new life not only to the church, but to the Pietist movement itself. In the words of Dorn: "This cultivated nobleman introduced a stimulating atmosphere into the stuffy and overheated Pietism of Spener and Francke."[1] By the middle of the eighteenth century the Moravians were the most effective of the Pietists,[2] particularly in northern Germany and the Scandinavian lands.

---

1. William L. Dorn, *Competition for Empire*, New York, 1950, pp. 238-239. This work is one of a series of texts on "The Rise of Modern Europe," edited by William L. Langer.

2. For a discussion on this shift of influence from the earlier Pietism to that of the Moravians see Paul Gruenberg and Carl Mirbt, "Pietism," in *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 1911, IX, pp. 53-67.

While the chief contribution of earlier Pietism had been to counteract the one-sidedness of orthodoxy, that of the Moravians was in combatting the one-sidedness of rationalism. The editor of the *Evangelische Zeitung*, Dr. Hengstenberg of Berlin, in the middle of the last century, credits the Brethren with saving the church during "the long and severe winter of infidelity"[3] that reigned in Germany during the time of rationalism. They kept the fires burning until the church regained some of her life. Another observer, Tiesemeyer, says in part:

> The more carefully one follows the strands of the Herrnhut Diaspora work, the more one is astounded by the great number of men who were influenced spiritually by the Brethren's Church, and who as a result stood as watchers on Zion's walls and let their voices be heard.[4]

Who some of these men were is revealed in the extensive correspondence connected with the Herrnhut Ministers' Conference. Ecke credits the Moravians through their Diaspora with preparing the way for the revival which the German churches experienced during the second quarter of the nineteenth century.[5] The wide circulation of Zinzendorf's writings, of Spangenberg's *Idea Fidei Fratrum* in seven languages and of Moravian mission and devotional literature, the active contacts with theologians of leading universities, the wide patronage of Moravian schools, all testify to the leavening influence of Zinzendorfian piety on an international scale. The dramatic impact of Moravian influence upon John Wesley and the Moravian schooling of Schleiermacher, separated by a half century, may appear to be isolated chance incidents. On the contrary, they are indices of a deep spiritual force channelizing itself through the humble Moravian Brotherhood.

II. Part of the new life which Pietism brought to the churches expressed itself in the mission awakening. This took the form of the organization of mission societies. The beginnings of these

---

3. Cited in the *Moravian Miscellany*, 1850, p. 6.
4. L. Tiesemeyer, *Die Erweckungsbewegung in Deutschland waehrend des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Kassel, p. 31, cited by Steinecke, p. 93.
5. ————————Ecke, *Die Evangelischen Landeskirchen Deutschlands im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, Berlin, 1904, p. 406, cited by Steinecke, I, p. 93.

societies and the activity of the Diaspora are so closely interwoven that it is impossible to disentangle them. Much of the impulse came from England, particularly through the London Missionary Society. This was in reality a giving back to the Continent what it had received from there in the first place. In this connection Warneck says:

> The sparks of the missionary fire which flew over from England to kindle a fire in Germany were to a significant degree the result of the quiet influence which the Brethren's Church exercised through her Diaspora work. Almost everywhere where the German mission awakening set in we stand upon ground prepared either directly or indirectly by the Brethren's Church.[6]

The first of the continental societies was the Netherlands Society begun in Rotterdam in 1797, largely in connection with the London Society.[7] In Berlin in 1800 Johann Jaenicke, Lutheran pastor of Bohemian refugees, began a school for the training of missionaries. This was also in close touch with London, receiving part of its support from England and sending many of its graduates into the service of the London Society. The graduates also served under the Netherlands Society and under the Church Society. Jaenicke was an active member of the Moravian Diaspora in Berlin.[8] The Basel Society, founded in 1815, came out of that evangelical circle which was in active touch with the Herrnhut Ministers' Conference. The influence of Basel in turn gave rise to other societies, such as the Rhenish Missionary Society in 1828, the Evangelical Lutheran Mission of Dresden in 1836, and in the same year to the North German Mission Society, an amalgamation of several local societies.[9] The two Berlin societies known as Berlin I and Berlin II were pioneered largely by individuals nurtured in Diaspora circles.[10] The same can be said of lesser known societies as those in Stettin, Quedlinburg, Burg, East Friesland, Lueneberg and others. The Scandinavian countries likewise shared in the awakening

---

6. Gustav Warneck, *Ueberblick ueber die innere und aeussere Entwicklung ler evangelischen Missionarbeit seit dem Auftreten Zinzendorf's bis Heute*, Herrnhut, 1900, p. 20, cited by Steinecke, I, p. 95
7. Latourette, IV, p. 89.
8. Steinecke, I, p. 93-94.
9. Latourette, I, p. 93.
10. Steinecke, I, p. 93.

and mission societies arose there.

As Warneck says, these societies came into being as free associations because of the indifference of the state churches to missions at the time. In a sense they can be regarded as encouraging the free church movement at the expense of the state churches. But as the century progressed the mission movement drew closer to the state churches and was instrumental in imparting new life to them. Particularly were Diaspora members with their close identification with Moravian missions a means of bringing the mission consciousness into the churches.[11]

III. The Pietist outlook was such that missions inevitably should spring from it. Its emphasis upon the individual, its concern for the religion of the common man as well as that of the elite, its preoccupation with the humanity of Jesus, were bound to come to expression in practical good works. The foreign mission impulse and that of inner missions were simply different phases of the same thing. Where we find one we can expect to find the other. Symbolic of this is the fact that Halle was early the scene of both schools for the poor and foreign mission activity. Zinzendorf from the first had this two-fold interest. The first school at Berthelsdorf was an *Armenschule* started in 1723. There is the same intimate connection between the Diaspora and the rise of inner missions as between the Diaspora and the rise of foreign missions. Wichern[12] was on cordial terms with the Moravians and received much inspiration from his contacts with them. In Norway Hans Nielson Hauge was an outstanding pioneer of inner missions and he too saw in the Brethren kindred spirits. Long before the formal organization of the movement by Wichern in 1849 the Brethren had been establishing a pattern for this type of religious activity in their Diaspora labors. Wichern's organization served to stimulate their activity along this line.[13]

---

11. *Ibid.*, p. 94.

12. Uttendorfer and Schmitt in *Die Brueder*, pp. 250-252, quote an interesting account written by Wichern of a visit he made to Herrnhut on June 25, 1853, in which he expressed his high esteem for the Brethren's way of life.

13. For a more detailed discussion of the connection between the Diaspora and inner missions see Chapter IV, pp.

IV. That the Moravian Diaspora has been a force for Protestant unity is quite apparent. In an age which had not yet emerged out of the dominance of Lutheran and Calvinistic dogmatic theology, Zinzendorf's heart religion, centering upon what was universal in Christian experience, was a refreshing note. The Diaspora adherents were a visible demonstration of the Count's ideal. Bound together, not by a creed, but by the deep, emotional and personal relationship of each individual to the person of Jesus, this scattered flock was a true union of genuine Christians. It mattered little whether outwardly they adhered to the Lutheran, Reformed, Anglican, or some other confession, so long as "their heart was right."

Zinzendorf wisely recognized that unity based on intellectual agreement was impossible. What is more, even had he thought it possible, he was opposed to it on the basis of his belief in religious individualism. The genius of his tropus scheme was that it provided the machinery for maintaining the identity of different churches, while binding them together in a deeper way. The theory of the Diaspora can be summed up in the Count's statement of his intention with reference to the ill-fated Pennsylvania Synods:

> I sought to enthrone the Lamb of God as real Creator, Preserver, Redeemer and Sanctifier of the whole world; and to introduce the catholicity of the doctrine of His passion as a universal theology for the Germans of Pennsylvania, in theory and practice.[14]

What came to an abortive end in Pennsylvania did succeed in Europe as the long history of the Diaspora so eloquently bears witness. Of course, the conventicles of the earlier Pietists also struck somewhat of a universal note in their emphasis upon experimental religion, but not nearly to the extent of the Moravian Diaspora. In the latter there was a deep sense of communion, amounting to a sense of urgency, running through a widely scattered fellowship. Actually the Moravian sense of urgency, imparted by Zinzendorf, was not so much to convert others as it was to establish rapport with those already converted.[15]

---

14. Levering, p. 81.

15. Unfriendly critics of the Moravians, as Harnack and Ritschl, point to the fact that the Brethren reaped the fruits of the work of others by going only

In this kind of Christian union the Moravians acted along the same lines as is Protestantism today in the ecumenical movement. The most significant trend in the realm of church union has not been the merger of denominations, but the federated type of union which seeks, amid the different communions, common grounds of Christian experience and action. It is not a coincidence, but rather a natural outgrowth of their heritage, that Moravians in both Europe and America should have been among the pioneers in the field of inter-church cooperation of which the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches are among the more recent ventures.

Indirectly, too, the Brethren served as a force for unity in their mission and philanthropic ventures. There has always been an interdenominational aspect to Moravian missions whose self-effacing evangelization of primitive peoples has evoked the support of other churches. In this the Diaspora has played an essential part.

V. The heightening of emotional life in the wake of the whole Pietist movement spread far beyond the bounds of organized religion. In this the Moravians especially were in a position to play a part because they were most active at the very time when the Romantic movement was taking shape. Some of the leading Romanticists were under the direct influence of the Brethren, among them Goethe, Schleiermacher and Novalis.[16]

---

to those communities where someone else had already evangelized. See Harnack, *Die Lutherische Kirche Livland's und die Herrnhutische Bruedergemeine*, p. 202, and Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, III, p. 445. Admitted that this observation is partially true, it is at the same time evidence that the Moravians were following the ideals of Zinzendorf. With respect to the Diaspora the Brethren conceived their mission to be primarily not one of conversion, but of gathering the converted (see Chapter II, footnote 2). This observation, of course, does not apply to the Moravians in their foreign mission work.

16. Goethe's mother was a member of the Moravian society in Frankfurt, as was her close friend Susanna Katherina von Klettenburg who became an intimate of the poet also. Fraulein von Klettenburg is the "schoene Seele" immortalized by Goethe. He was on cordial terms with many of the Brethren and referred to Zinzendorf as "his count." Schleiermacher received his elementary schooling in two Moravian schools, at Niesky and at Barby. At one time he referred to himself as "a Pietist of a higher order," and at another time as "a Moravian of a higher order." Novalis' parents stood close to the Herrnhuters, and he himself was partly educated by a Moravian minister. It is said that among the books he read most were the Bible, Zinzendorf and Lavater.

Concerning Zinzendorf's place in Romanticism Dorn says:

> The most energetic apostle of Pietism in the middle decades of the century was the gentle Count von Zinzendorf, doubtless the most inspired leader of northern Europe before Kierkegaard and the only German between Leibnitz and Winckelmann to exercise any influence outside of Germany. . . . Despite his hostility to the Enlightenment, Zinzendorf at bottom agreed with Lessing in the belief that the essence of religion is sentiment and practical morality. Lessing's gospel of love and tolerance as reflected in his *Nathan der Weise* was also that of Zinzendorf. When he died in 1760 Zinzendorf's sentimental religious movement had entered the broad stream of German culture and literature. Together with Russeau he must be regarded as one of the originators of the German romantic movement.[17]

The Pietist emphasis upon a rich interior life produced among its followers a great volume of correspondence, diaries, hymns, testimonials,[18] which were the forerunners of the richer emotional expression in German literature in general.

Basic to this change in literature was the impulse which Pietism gave to the use of the vernacular, as opposed to the use of Latin and aristocratic French among the cultured classes.[19] Pietist leaders taught the upper classes to abandon their French culture and to "speak, pray, sing and confess in their mother tongue." Pietism's interest in the vernacular was due to its concern for the religion of the common man.

Concern for the common man did not stop with verbal expression but had its effect also in the development of public education in which Pietist schools helped set the pattern. Still further, there was the increased attention to social welfare and philanthropy. One phase of this, as noted, was the inner mission movement, but much more important was the social legislation in which Germany under Bismark was in advance of most countries.

---

17. *Competition for Empire*, p. 238-240.
18. This type of literature occupies a priminent place in Moravian writings. Most representative perhaps is the familiar "Lebenslauf" of Brethren of high and low stations alike.
19. Dorn, p. 238. Zinzendorf, though one of those who helped in this trend toward the use of the vernacular, himself reflects the influence of French culture upon the upper classes. His style of speaking and writing abounds in foreign phrases, among them many in French.

The overall effect, however, is best to be seen in the development of German nationalism, as Pinson[20] so ably shows. Pietism provided the needed emotional basis; introduced the concept of multiplicity and variety, providing nationalism with a philosophic basis; and gave the lower classes a greater feeling of self-respect and prestige, thus helping to cement the various classes into a unified national whole. The shift from the religious to the secular realm was accomplished through the Enlightenment. The enthusiasm and social kinship which first found their outlets in the fellowship groups held together by a "heart religion," when they had become secularized, found their outlets in the national group.[21]

Moravians of the Renewed Church, both in their congregations and in the Diaspora, have always demonstrated their loyalty to the state. In this they have reflected the conservative nature of German Protestantism in general, including Pietism. It is clear how much of the existence of the Renewed Church was due to the patronage of the nobility, from royalty on down. The description of the conservative nature of Pietism as given by Troeltsch[22] would certainly apply to the Moravians of the Diaspora. Loyalty to the state is something we would expect from them. But there seems to be something more positive than mere conservatism in this loyalty. It is doubtless more than coincidence that such aggressive proponents of German nationalism as William I, Bismark,[23] William II, Roon and Count Zeppelin, to mention only a few, were admirers of the Brethren and readers of their devotional manual, the *Daily Texts*.[24] Moravian schools from the time of their founding have had a generous representation of children from the ranks of the ruling classes. Despite scattered local opposition to them,

20. Koppel Pinson, *Pietism as a Factor in the Rise of German Nationalism*, New York, 1933.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
22. Ernest Troeltsch, *The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches*, 1911, trans. Olive Wyon, 1931, II, pp. 214-221.
23. For a discussion of Bismark's personal religious life see Arnold Oskar Meyer, *Bismark's Glaube*, Munich, 1933. This volume has in it photostatic reproductions of several pages of Daily Texts with Bismark's handwritten notations in the margin.
24. Uttendorf and Schmitt, *Die Brueder*, p. 263ff.

Moravians in Germany have been regarded by the powers that be as an influence on the side of unity and the loyalty of the people to the state and its institutions. Furthermore, the Diaspora as a widely scattered fellowship cutting across territorial lines, helped to bring together spiritually the citizens of the many German states. Beyond that the Diaspora was a factor in maintaining German identity among Germans living outside the fatherland, as in Poland, the Baltic states, the Scandinavian lands, and wherever it existed.

In trying to understand how the Brethren, so few in numbers, could make such contributions, it is necessary to examine their status as both a church and as a society within the church. In doing this we find at the same time the Renewed Moravian Church to be an excellent case history for the study of enthusiasm in religion. Moravians were not unique in their efforts to stay within the establishment.[25] Most of the founders of new sects begin in the naive belief that they can accomplish their purpose without separation. But Moravianism is unique in that it combined conformity and separation somewhat in the same way that orders do in Roman Catholicism. The genius of Catholicism is that it escapes sectarianism by the formation of orders, thus retaining within the bosom of the church the creative vitality of new movements. The Moravian Church in Europe can almost be said to be a type of Protestant monasticism—minus the celibacy.

It has been their two-fold character of being both a church and a society that has enabled the Moravians to serve the church universal in a way which few other groups have been able to do. As a society alone they would have differed little from the earlier *ecclesiolae* whose offspring in large part they were. With only such a status the Moravian movement would very likely have suffered the same fate as Pietism in general during the later eighteenth century. Non-Moravian Pietism, in the main stream of church life, was able to survive neither the opposition of orthodox Lutheranism nor the rationalism of the Enlightenment.

25. Knox expresses it thus: "It is an old dream of the enthusiast, not extinct in our time, that he can start a new religion without starting a new denomination," from *Enthusiasm*, p. 403.

The Diaspora societies, on the other hand, under the close supervision of the Moravian Church, a rigidly organized, exclusive community, were able to maintain their identity more easily. Hence the Diaspora provided focal points for the maintenance of a piety that was elsewhere waging a losing battle. The secret of the continuing vitality of Moravian Pietism has been the intimate relationship between the Diaspora societies and the settlement congregations. Members of the state churches have been drawn to the Diaspora not only because of the warmth of the societies themselves, but also because these were the outreach of Moravian settlements into the life of the outside world. The dozen closed Moravian villages which had been established between 1722 and 1773[26] were by the end of the century held in high esteem as model Christian communities. There was a long waiting list of those wishing to join the Brethren and to establish residence in their settlements. For most of the aspirants this wish was never granted, for the Brethren kept the bars high for outsiders. This exclusiveness, coupled with the dedicated, disciplined living of the membership and the sacrificial heroism of Moravian missionaries enhanced the attraction the Brethren held for their admirers. The Brethren's own conception of the importance of their settlements to their over-all plan is expressed in these words:

> These congregations are places, which our Saviour has chosen, upon which a particular Grace rests; they are a Phenomenon of the 18th Century, never heard of before in History.
>
> They are Congregations of Jesus Christ, which live separate and according to the laws and statutes of the Lord, walk both in inward and outward Matters, agreeable to the strictest Rule, whose members not only have a Heart to our Saviour, but also a clear insight into his intention with us; a particular election of Grace is required for it. Our Saviour's intention with His Oeconomy of Grace in this Century would not have been accomplished in the different religious, without Congregation places.
>
> They are intended for a testimony to the World, which will effect more than ever so many preachings. . . . They are Seminaries for

26. All but one of the Moravian settlements on the Continent were built within this period. The one exception is Koenigsfeld, built in 1807. The few churches established in the 19th and 20th centuries were all, with this exception, city congregations.

witnesses and we ought to have an Eye upon those who are cut out for it.[27]

The similarity of such a holy community to the members of a monastic community is striking. It was these islands of spirituality which set the Brethren apart. Without them the Diaspora societies would have had no fountain head. It was from these settlements that there came the life of the Diaspora, through the medium of the itinerant workers. The development of the Moravian church independently of the state church, counter to Zinzendorf's wishes, paradoxically was the very thing necessary for the realization of his ideal congregation of God in the spirit. Left to themselves the Brethren could develop the necessary exclusiveness to keep their group a company of the elect. The Count again and again expressed regret that the Moravian refugees had gotten in the way of his original idea. What he never fully realized is that the independent Moravian Church which they thrust upon him meant the implementing of his plans. He was, however, partially justified in his aversion to an independent church, for had this church grown numerically to significant proportions, its other role as a society would have been weakened. While a small Moravian Church was essential to Zinzendorf's original plan, a large one would have stood in the way of it. Herrnhut and its companion settlements became the headquarters of an interdenominational fellowship, a fellowship tolerated and even welcomed by the established church, because Herrnhut never was in competition with the church.

Supplementing the work of the itinerants as a means of sharing Moravianism with the society members were the Diaspora conferences in the settlements. The one at Herrnhut in the first half century was usually attended by five or six hundred persons from the surrounding area. Among the activities of Zinzendorf in his last few years was the delivering of addresses to these Diaspora congregations. In between such conferences many of the Diaspora flock made visits to these settlements. In Herrn-

27. "A short Relation and Abstract of the Conference kept with all the Labourers of the Pennsylvania Town and Country Congregations assembled at Lititz from the 17th till the 19th of April, 1765," as found in "Amerikanische Provincial Synoden, 1765, 1766, 1768," MS in Moravian Archives.

hut already in the days of the Count a building known as the Diaspora house was set aside for the accommodation of such visitors. For the Diaspora agents themselves the journeys to Herrnhut, or to one of the other centers, for instructions from headquarters, or for furloughs and rest periods, were important for the maintaining of a high morale. Thus did the spiritual life of the holy community flow out to the world around.

Few as the Brethren were in numbers, the two-fold loyalty of the Diaspora constituency was frequently a point of tension. It was a reason why in many communities state pastors did not permit the existence of Diaspora societies. The long standing feud between Moravians and Lutheran authorities in the Baltic provinces is the most marked illustration of this conflict.

Religious enthusiasts usually do try the patience of the leaders in charge of conventional churches. So too was often the case in Diaspora circles. It was only natural that many a pastor should have resented a Herrnhuter coming into his parish to conduct meetings. The disturbing influence of such "outsiders" upon normal parish life has been sufficiently common to make pastors feel uneasy. Even, as in the case of the Moravians, where there was a clear record of continued loyalty to the establishment, there always existed the temptation on the part of the Diaspora group to regard the life of the society as more important than the life of the church itself. This is the contention of Harnack and Ritschl.[28] They concede that the Moravians preached loyalty to the church, but go on to add that the Moravians represent a more subtle type of sectarianism which remains outwardly conformable, yet is inwardly alienated. They judge this type of separation to be the more dangerous of the two.

Sessler[29] touches upon the problem in his discussion of the Pennsylvania Synods. As he points out, it is true that Zinzendorf did not seek to spread Moravianism, if by Moravianism we mean a denomination, for to Zinzendorf the Brethren were not a denomination, but an elite community of Christians gathered

28. Harnack, *Die Lutherisch Kirche und die Herrnhutische Bruedergemeine*, p. 202, and Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, III, p. 447.
29. *Communal Pietism*, p. 62.

from all churches' bodies. However, as time went on, this elite community—in Europe the Diaspora—though still belonging to the state church, became practically a denomination of its own, in effect associate members of the Moravian Church.

Some might develop a case against the Moravians in accusing them of preparing the soil for defections from the state churches, despite their professed loyalty to it. Thus for instance, Moravianism gave birth to Methodism in England; [30] a Gustave Lammers in Norway, spiritually awakened by the Moravians, becomes the founder of the Baptists there; a George Mueller, converted in a Diaspora meeting, becomes a free lance preacher and philanthropist; in Germany where Diaspora circles were strong the free church movement has a warm reception; likewise in the Baltic provinces free churches flourish in former Diaspora territory. The experiential heart religion of the Pietists is potentially free church religion, and the Moravians were a significant factor in fostering it. They were successful in their own circles in retaining it within the established churches, but when the free church movement took on accelerated impulse, and with political controls relaxed, it was more than the Moravians could cope with.

But surely the Moravians, or any other group that arouses the spiritually indifferent, cannot be held responsible for the far-reaching implications of their work. Zeal and sectarianism, it must be admitted, go hand in hand, a problem which the church has faced since the time of the Montanists in the second century, and a problem which it will always face. Granted that the type of religious expression fostered by the Diaspora means potentially some separatism, from another point of view the Moravian Church in its Diaspora is a rather striking illustration of how the enthusiasm of a free association can be incorporated into the doctrinal and liturgical aspects of an ecclesia. While the influence of the Moravians gave vitality to free church movements, it did the same for state churches. Steinecke, himself a Lutheran state pastor, in defending the Moravians against the charge of incipient sectarianism says:

30. Concerning the situation in England Knox says: "In our literature Moravianism will chiefly be remembered because our native enthusiasts have stolen its thunders," from *Enthusiasm*, p. 404.

> On the contrary, the Diaspora members always have had the reputation of the most faithful churchliness. Innumerable are the testimonies of the clergy who see in them the kernel and the star of their congregations. . . . In the course of official visits church administrators could report that the friends of the Brethren's Church are to be counted among the best members of the church.[31]

If the Diaspora needed the small Moravian Church for inspiration and cohesion, that church also needed the Diaspora. Without these far-flung connections with the broader life of the state churches the Moravian communities would have become seriously ingrown, a development they have not completely escaped. The vitality which the closely knit, small Moravian Church gave to its widely scattered clientele had a reverse reaction. Those outside of the Moravian Church, but in connection with it, brought new life into the communities of the Brethren. Exclusiveness kept the Brethren from the diluting effects of rapid numerical growth, so often experienced by groups which begin their existence with high vision. Yet from the Diaspora circles enough individuals were admitted into the membership of the church to diminish stagnation. It was this intimate connection with the state church which helped to lift the Moravians out of the category of a mere sect.

There were periods when, by the Brethren's own admission, the life of the societies was in a more wholesome state than that of the settlements themselves. Thus for instance, in synodal reports the Diaspora is referred to as a source of life for the congregation. The synod of 1857 specifically recognizes the Diaspora as "a channel through which new life has flowed from the church to us," and as a means of counteracting "that one-sidedness and that stagnation of spiritual life to which every small community is exposed."[32]

New members from the Diaspora were just about enough to balance losses sustained by removals from the settlements of those seeking employment elsewhere, or who left because they chafed under the restrictions of Moravian regulations, Naturally those coming into the Moravian group because of a deep de-

31. *Die Diaspora*, I, p. 86.
32. *Synodal Results*, 1857 London, 1858, English version, p. 100.

sire to become Herrnhuters, were more than a welcome exchange for those from whom some of the zeal had departed.

A rather large proportion of the members coming into the Moravian Church from the Diaspora entered into the full time service of the Brethren, as missionaries on the foreign field, as pastors, as Diaspora agents, as teachers in Moravian schools, as deaconesses, or as servants of the church in one of her business enterprises. As Moravian missions expanded, while the church at home remained stationary in membership, this recruiting of personnel became increasingly important, as did the securing of outside financial support for Moravian causes. It would be an extremely difficult task to determine just what proportion of Moravian leaders have been reared in Diaspora circles, but certainly that proportion would be high. Many Moravian missionaries have come from Poland, the Baltic states, the Scandinavian countries, Holland, Switzerland. Since the work in these lands is almost exclusively Diaspora, most of the personnel which came from these areas would be products of the Diaspora. Even for those coming from Germany, we note again and again in reading memoirs in the church's mission literature how many leaders have been of Diaspora background.

In an appraisal of the Diaspora's contribution to the religious and national life of Germany, such as the foregoing pages have attempted to present, the distinction between Moravian Pietism and Pietism in general cannot always be clearly drawn. On many points what is said of the one applies to the other. Yet in several areas the Moravian contribution clearly identifies itself. The missionary aspect of Pietism is illustrative. To be sure, the mission impulse was pre-Moravian, the Brethren getting it from Halle through Zinzendorf. But as the eighteenth century advanced it was through the Moravians that the missionary awakening was eventually imparted to Protestantism as a whole, including German Lutheranism itself. This is in part due to the more universal note struck by Moravian preaching. As Mirbt says:

> Under Zinzendorf the Moravian type of missionary preaching, unlike that of the Danish and Halle missions, took the noteworthy course of preaching simply the law of Christ, and not Lutheran

dogma.[33]

Furthermore, Moravians advanced the mission cause in utilising laymen as missionaries, which had not been done hitherto. It was this simple concept of mission presentation, in which even the humblest might participate, which the Moravian Diaspora spread throughout Europe. This coupled with the Moravian demonstration of it in their extensive work among primitive peoples, struck a responsive chord. Thus it was that German piety of the nineteenth century was so closely associated with the formation of mission societies.

A word can be said, too, about the Moravians being the chief connecting link between the Pietism of the eighteenth century and that of the nineteenth. It was in those very years when the earlier Pietism was succumbing to the rationalism of the Enlightment that the Moravian Diaspora was at the height of its influence. How the sheltered atmosphere of the settlement congregations made this possible has already been noted. This left the Brethren in a position to play a part in the revival of spiritual life beginning shortly before the second quarter of the nineteenth century.

This nineteenth century Pietism, though resulting on the one hand in the rise of free churches, tended, on the other hand, to coalesce with the state churches themselves. The conventicles of this later Pietism had a more cordial relationship with the church than those of the preceding century. Here the Moravian emphasis upon cooperation with the establishment was of great influence. Paradoxically, part of the credit for this must go to the Enlightenment itself. In at least this much Pietism and the Enlightenment had the same goal, both worked against clericalism. The result was that the Pietism which developed after the Napoleonic wars had less opposition from the clergy. An exception was the case of the Moravian Diaspora in Baltic Russia.

In helping to carry Pietism over into the nineteenth century, the Moravians, likewise, were able to make their contribution to the rise of works of practical benevolence, which culminated in the inner mission movement. A noteworthy example of this

33. Carl Mirbt, "Pietism," in *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, IX, p. 64.

is the story of *Die Deutsche Christentumsgesellschaft* established at Basel in 1782. Using the same methods as the Diaspora and the Herrnhut Ministers' Conference, it brought believing, earnest Christians together, both through personal contact and correspondence. Between the Diaspora and this movement there was mutual stimulation and overlapping of membership. Jaenicke, founder of the Berlin Mission School in 1800, and Steinkopf, who went to England where he became one of the founders of the British Foreign Bible Society, are two conspicuous examples of this. Out of the Christentumsgesellschaft came such fruits as the Basel Bible Society (1804), the Basel Mission House (1815), a training school and orphanage at Bengsen (1820), the Society of the Friends of Israel (1831), the Society for the Spread of Christian Literature (1835), the deaf and dumb asylum at Riehen (1838) and the deaconess home in the same place (1852).[34] It is clear from this observation how the Moravian Diaspora was a background factor in this type of reform movement within Lutheranism.

Concerning the more intellectual aspects of Christian experience, Moravianism by its inherent nature, largely excludes itself from this realm. Zinzendorf himself repeatedly warned against looking to theology as a basis for Christian fellowship, and referred his followers to the more subjective elements of personal religious experience as that which strikes a universal note. Consequently Moravianism has not given rise to original theologies or fresh intellectual interpretations of faith. But it has been a great force for the transformation of life individually, and, indirectly, collectively also. The Moravian contribution has been that of a leaven or a catalyst in the evangelical movements of practical reform and charity in the past two centuries.

The two-fold status of the Moravians as a denomination and as a society continues, but the center of gravity has definitely shifted to the side of the denomination, the tide having been moving in that direction since the middle of the last century. It is clear from a study of the more recent history of the Diaspora that it is

34. George W. Gilmore, "Die Deutsche Christentumsgesellschaft," in *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, III, p. 38.

less of an ecumenical enterprise than it once was. The widely scattered fellowship which at one time was the elite company of Zinzendorf's congregation of God in the Spirit is perhaps more accurately designated today simply as "friends of the Moravian Church."

Such a development is what the church historian would expect. Moravians have resisted it longer than have most groups. The process of the denominationalizing of the Diaspora is easily explained. The Moravian Church has remained small but influential, evoking the admiration of Protestantism in general. But as the things the Brethren stood for became increasingly the possession of other churches, or as the Brethren paid less attention to them themselves, or as time made obsolete their once useful social organization in the settlements, the Moravians felt their position relatively less important. The instinct of self preservation began to assert itself. So today the Moravians the world over, having less and less to distinguish themselves from the Christian community in general, but with a justifiable pride in their past, are making a special effort to perpetuate themselves. This is not said in a critical spirit, but merely as an observation of a social process. Moravian leaders themselves are aware of it.[35] Moravians in both Europe and America, seeing others doing on a greatly multiplied scale what their forefathers pioneered are uneasy about their own reason for their continued existence as a separate denomination. Looking back upon the growth of other churches much younger, they wistfully speculate on what might have been the size of their denomination had they not clung to the society pattern for so long.

Yet the ecumenical heritage of the Brethren is by no means a thing of the past. Though denominationally more self-conscious than in earlier years, the various branches of the Unity are participating wholeheartedly in the various ecumenical movements of the present day. The Moravians today tend to favor the federated type of church activity, knowing that for a group

35. Bauer says: "The character of the Diaspora dare not be to gather friends of the Moravian Church, but the true children of God in all the world," in *Zeitschrift fuer Bruedergeschichte*, 1911, p. 187.

as small as their's union would be absorption rather than union. They are still disciples of Zinzendorf in their oft-stated conviction that true unity is spiritual rather than organizational. Conscious that their fellowship has always exerted a force for the unity of true children of God, they feel that they can contribute more to a united church by maintaining their identity than by losing it. The spirit of Moravianism, whether Diaspora or denomination, still can be expressed by a motto, though not original with the Brethren, in use already in the days of the Bohemian Brethren and passed on to the Renewed Church: "In essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty, in all things charity."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. *Primary Sources*

A. *Manuscript* (All the following are in the Moravian Archieves in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania)

"Amerikanische Provincial Synoden," 1748-1825, 20 vol. Some of these are in German, some in English, some in both.

"Diarium Bethlehem," 1742-1871, 50 vol.

"Diarium der Huetten," 1747-1755.

"Juengerhaus Diarium," 1756-1760.

"Gemeinhaus Diarium," 1761-1764.

"Gemein Nachtrichten," 1765-1818.

These four works, consisting of 156 volumes, are all in the same series, being a denominational diary with an account of the activities of the Moravians throughout the world.

"Minutes of the Herrnhut Ministers' Conference," 1788, 1790, 1799, 1800, 1801, 1804.

These are unbound papers.

Miscellaneous unbound papers:

"Account of Livonia 1741"

"A Prayer Day Held the 19th Aug. 1744 in the Chappel at Marienborn"

"Extracts of some accounts taken out of some letters from Sweedland, 1746"

"Nachrichten der Unitaets Aeltesten Conferenz," 1764-1858, 11 volumes.

"Synodal Verlass," (Results of General Synods) 23 vol., 1746, 1764, 1769, 1775, 1782, 1801, 1818, 1825, 1836.

B. *Printed*

Acta Fratrum Unitatis in Anglia, London, 1749, "Report from the committee to whom the petition of the deputies of the United Brethren was referred; together with some extracts of the most material vouchers and papers contained in the appendix of the said report."

Addressbuch der Brueder-Unitaet, Herrnhut, 1901.

Barbysche Samlungen, Barby, 1760.

Bauer, Hermann, "Das Diasporawerk der Bruedergemeine," in *Zeitschrift fuer Bruedergeschichte*, Herrnhut, 1911.

———— *Uberblick ueber die Gemeinschaftspflege (Diasporawerk) der Bruedergemeine*, Jansa, Gnadau, 1910.

Benham, Daniel, *Memoirs of James Hutton, comprising the annals of his life and connection with the United Brethren*, London, 1856.

Bericht der Prediger Conferenz gehalten in Bethlehem vom 16ten bis 20sten September, 1852.

Der Brueder Bote, 1862-1891.

Brueder Kalendar, 1900.

Buedingische Samlungen einiger in die Kirchenhistorie einschlagender sonderlich neuerer Schriften, 18 parts in 3 volumes, Buedingen, 1740-1745.

Daily Texts of the Moravian Church, Bethlehem. (Published annually since 1731, in modern times with a statistical appendix. The German version is known as *Das Losungsbuch.*)

Diaspora reports variously titled as follows:

Die Arbeit der Brueder-Gemeine in der Diaspora, Gnadau, 1860.

Bericht der Deutschen Unitaets-Direction ueber die Diasporaarbeit an die Gemeinen vom Jahr 1903. Kurze Mittheilungen aus dem Diasporawerk der Bruedergemeine auf dem Europaisischen Festlande, Herrnhut, 1881, 1877, 1882, 1883. *Ueberlick ueber den Gang des Diasporawerkes der Bruedergemeine*, Gnadau, 1859 through 1877.

District synode West der Festlaendisch-Europaischen Brueder-Unitaet, Tagung, 1949, Bericht der Unitaets Direktion, Bad Boll, 1949.

Gemein Nachtrichten, 1819-1894.
A continuation of the manuscript of the same title.
Jahrbuch der Bruedergemeine, Gustav Winter, Herrnhut, 1927-1937.
Jensen, Th., *Unser Diasporawerk*, Herrnhut, 1920.
Mittheilungen aus der Bruedergemeine, 1895. (A continuation of the *Gemein Nachtrichten.*)
Moravian Church Miscellany, monthly, 6 vol., 1850-1855.
The Moravian, 1857- , weekly, successor to the *Moravian Church Miscellany.*
The Moravian Messenger, 1850- , monthly, the British Moravian church paper.
Muller, George, *A Narrative of Some of the Lord's Dealings with George Muller*, London, 1840.
Ratio Disciplinae Ordinisque Ecclesiastici in Unitate Fratrum Bohemorum, trans. by B. Seiffert, London, 1866.
Renkewitz, Heinz, *Die Bruedergemeine ihr Auftrag und ihre Gestalt*, Steinkopf. Stuttgart, 1949.
Second Report of the United Brethren's Society for Propagating the Gospel in Ireland, for the Year 1830-31, Bradford, 1831.
Spangenberg, Augustus Gottlieb, *Leben des Herrn Nicolaus Ludwig Grafen und Herrn von Zinzendorf und Pottendorf*, 3 vol., Barby, 1772-1775, translated and abridged by Samuel Jackson and published under the title, *Life of Nicolaus Lewis Count Zinzendorf*, London, 1838.
Zinzendorf, N. L., *Naturelle Reflexiones ueber allerhand Materien*, 12 parts, 9 supplements, Ebersdorf, 1746-1749.
———————— *Theologische Bedenken*, Buedingen, 1742.
Synodal Results, 1857, London, 1858.

II. *Secondary Sources*

Addison, William George, *The Renewed Church of the United Brethren, 1722-1930*, S.P.C.K., London and MacMillan, New York, 1932.
Allen, Walser H., *The Moravians, A World-Wide Fellowship*, Bethlehem, 1940.
Baudert, S. and Steinmann, Th., *Die Welt der Stillen im Lande*, Berlin, 1922.
Becker, Bernhard, *Zinzendorf im Verhaeltnis zu Philosophie und Kirchentum seiner Zeit*, Leipsig, 1866.
Block, Marguerite Beck, *The New Church in the New World*, New York, 1932.
Burkhardt, G., *Die Bruedergemeine*, 2 vol., Gnadau, 1893, 1897.
Clewell, J. H., *History of Wachovia in North Carolina*, New York, 1902.
Cranz, David, *Ancient and Modern History of the Brethren*, trans. by Benjamin LaTrobe, London, 1780.
Croeger, E. W., *Geschichte der Erneuerten Bruederkirche*, 2 vol., Gnadau, 1852, 1854.
Cyclopedia of Ecclesiastical and Theological Literature, III Harpers, New York, 1894.
deSchweinitz, Edmund, *The History of the Church Known as the Unitas Fratrum*, Bethlehem, 1885.
Encyclopedia Britannica, I, 14th edition.
Groendahl, S., "Die Bruedergemeine in Schweden von 1727 bis 1744," in the *Herrnhut*, nos. 5-11, 1910.
Hamilton, John Taylor, *A History of the Church Known as the Moravian Church, or the Unity of the Brethren, or the Unitas Fratrum, during the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*, Bethlehem, 1900.
Harnack, Th., *Die Lutherische Kirche Livlands unde die herrnhutische Bruedergemeine*, Erlangen, 1860.
Hegner, J. K., *Fortsetzung von David Cranzens Brueder Historie*, 3 vol., Barby, 1791, 1894.
Herman, Stewart W., "Germany and Austria," in Henry Smith Leiper's *Christianity Today*, Morehouse, New York, 1947.

Holmes, John, *History of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren*, 2 vol., London, 1825, 1830.
Holmquist, Hjalmar in *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, New York, XI 1911.
Hutton, J. E., *History of the Moravian Church*, London, 1909.
A History of Moravian Missions, London, 1922.
Keller, Adolf and Steward, George, *Protestant Europe: Its Crisis and Outlook*, Doran, New York, 1927.
Knox, R. A., *Enthusiasm*, Oxford University Press, 1950.
Latourette, Kenneth Scott, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, IV, Harpers, New York, 1941.
Levering, J. M., *A History of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, 1741-1892*, Bethlehem, 1903.
Memorial Days of the Renewed Moravian Church of the Brethren, trans. from the German, Acton Under-Lyn, England, 1822.
Meyer, Arnold Oskar, *Bismark's Glaube*, Becksche, Munich, 1933.
Mirbt, Carl, "Pietism," in *The New Schaff, Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Funk and Wagnalls, New York, 1911.
Monatschrift fuer Diakonie und innere Mission, Hamburg, 1879.
Mueller, Joseph T., *Zinzendorf als Erneuer der alten Bruederkirche*, Jansa, Leipsig, 1900.
Pinson, Koppel S., *Pietism as a Factor in the Rise of German Nationalism*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1934.
Pleijel, Hilding, *Svenska Kyrkans Historia*, V, Lund, 1935.
Pleijel, Hilding, *Das Kirchenproblem der Bruedergemeine in Schweden*, Lund, 1938
Plitt, Hermann, *Die Bruedergemeine und die Lutherische Kirche in Livland*, Gotha, 1861.
Reichel, L. T., *Early History of the Church of the United Brethren*, 1734-1738, Nazareth, Pa., 1888.
Ritschl, Albrecht, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, 3 vol., Bonn, 1880, 1886.
Schneider, Hermann G., in a review of Nils Jacobsson's *Den Svenska Herrnhutismens Uppkomst* in *Zeitschrift fuer Bruedergeschichte*, 1907-1908.
Sessler, Jacob John, *Communal Pietism Among Early American Moravians*, Holt, New York, 1933.
Steinecke, O., *Die Diaspora der Bruedergemeine in Deutschland*, 2 vol., Miehlmann, Halle, 1905, 1911.
Stocker, Harry Emilius, *A Home Mission History of the Moravian Church in the United States and Canada*, Bethlehem, 1924.
Thompson, A. C., *Protestant Missions, Their Rise and Early Progress*, Scribners, New York, 1894.
Toksvig, Signe, *Emanuel Swedenborg*, Yale University Press, 1948.
Troeltsch, Ernst, *The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches*, trans. by Olive Wyon, 2 vol., MacMillan, 1931.
Uttendorfer, Otto and Schmidt, Walther, *Die Brueder*, Gnadau, 1914.
Voigt, Friederich Adolf, *Zinzendorf's Sendung, ein Rueckblick zur Orientierung ueber die kirchliche Lage der Gegenwart*, Furche, Berlin, 1922.
Warneck, Gustav, *Outline of a History of Protestant Missions*, trans. by George Robson, Revell, New York, 1901.
Wordsworth, John, *The National Church of Sweden*, Chicago, 1940.

THE 101ST ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MORAVIAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY OCTOBER 9, 1958

This meeting was called to order by the President Bishop S.H. Gapp at 10 a.m. in the museum room of the Whitefield House at Nazareth. Twenty-three members were present for this business session.

The President requested the Report of the Nominating Committee before other business, explaining that he had notified the Committee that he would not serve again as President and that he would like his successor to preside at the meetings today. The Nominating Committee stated in its report that a new office should be added to the roster, that of President Emeritus. This report was accepted and on motion the Secretary cast the ballot, re-electing all the officers of the previous year with the exception that Bishop Gapp was elected President Emeritus, and Dr. John Weinlick was elected President, removing his name from the list of Vice Presidents. At this point Bishop Gapp turned over the chair to Dr. Weinlick.

The minutes of the last annual meeting by consent of the session were not read as they had been approved by the Executive Committee in their meeting of February 11, 1958.

Treasurer William E. Henry submitted his annual report, examined and audited with the treasurer's books by the auditors, Andrew G. Kern and Frank R. Huth. He reported cash on hand $2240.01. Investments $15,971.25. Trust Funds $12,583.05. The report was accepted.

The Publication Committee reported Brother Henry Williams as its new Secretary and Dr. John R. Weinlick as its chairman succeeding the Rev. Robert Brennecke who was obliged to retire from this activity by his removal to Connecticut. This Committee reported that its next publication was to be Dr. Weinlick's thesis on the "Moravian Diaspora" but that there was not enough money in the publication allotment to cover the cost of same.

Walter Peters reporting for the Library Committee stated that the $2000. previously appropriated for display of the Heidt Paintings and renovations to the museum rooms was not sufficient to complete the job and suggested that this matter be postponed until more money was available so that the job could be done all at one time. Since this is in the hands of the Library Committee, no action was taken. Bro. Brennecke for the Library Committee called attention to the many valuable books we have, but stated that these are not easily accessible, that they are in a woeful state of admixture, not classified in groups, and without alphabetical index. For this purpose the use of the rooms upstairs was suggested. These rooms under the control of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, the matter of a definite form of agreement with the S.P.G. for the use of these rooms was introduced. It was moved to refer this to the Executive Committee and that an agreement for the use of these rooms be obtained.

The Curator and Librarian, the Rev. E. H. Swavely, submitted his report which was accepted and filed for further consideration. He reported the sustained active interest of the Women's Whitefield Guild and its services in conducting guests through the Museum in their Moravian costumes. He announced the sale of 100 copies of the History of Nazareth at $1.50 per copy for use as text books. The report listed the following acquisitions to the Museum:

2 Pine Chests from the Nazareth Moravian Church parsonage. A grandfather's clock and blanket chest from the Knecht Estate. A cello made by Hartmann in Nazareth in 1858. A case of musical instruments, music, hymn books, love feast cups from the Schoeneck Moravian Congregation. A large picture of "Zeisberger Preaching to the Indians", some smaller ones, a walking cane made from the wood of the first church building at Schoeneck from Miss Nellie Loux. A Putz which was constructed with much time and effort by Mrs. Jennie Trein. The following articles were also donated by Mrs. Trein: Atlas—Burrit's Geography of the Heavens published in 1856, a human hair wreath done by Sally Reich in 1867, an African medicine mask, an old fashioned cream whipper, six skeins of flax from the Achenbach

Farm, a trombone and two music holders used by the Trein family at the Schoeneck Church, an old knapsack, a canteen and saber used in the Civil War.

A picture of the Gray Cottage by Miss Catherine Schisler presently hangs on the wall of the Museum and is offered to our Society for $75.00. Action on this is referred to the Library Committee.

The Whitefield Guild reported its activity during the past year and added to their list of papers reported previously: The Upper Places by Miss Miriam Michael, The Moravian Graveyard by Miss Carolyn Wunderly, Child Nature and Nurture According to Count Zinzendorf by Miss Mary Altemose.

On motion of Walter Peters and Andrew Kern, Curator E. H. Swavely was voted an increase in salary from $200.00 to $300.00.

The matter of increased dues was discussed and on motion of Walter Peters and the Rev. Reuben Gross, this matter was referred to the Executive Committee for report to the next annual meeting in compliance with the Rules of Order and By-Laws.

The Rev. Allen Hedgecock introduced the matter of securing color slides of historical places of Moravian originality around the area. This was referred to the Library Committee.

Meeting adjourned for attendance at the Vesper.

A brief meeting of the Executive Committee was held immediately following the above meeting for the purpose of passing on the application for membership, and the following were accepted as members:

Mrs. Flossie Breinig; Mrs. Walter Wood; Mrs. Frank Heintzelman; Frank Heintzelman; Mrs. Anna B. Manning; Mrs. Joseph F. Strakey; Curtis W. Garrison; John Koercher; Rev. William A. Cranford; Mrs. Paul Spogen; Mrs. H. J. Bowles; Mrs. Lee Butterfield; the Memorial Library of Nazareth.

The Vesper Meeting.

At 1 p.m. in the Social Rooms of the Nazareth Moravian Church, the members and guests numbering about 175 sat down to a luncheon prepared and served by a Committee of the Nazareth members of the Historical Society.

Bishop Gapp opened the meeting and after singing of grace, he announced the election at the morning session of Dr. John R. Weinlick as the new President, who then took over presiding at this session.

The Nazareth Trombone Choir played Moravian Chorales preceding the luncheon.

Dr. Weinlick expressed appreciation for the many years of faithful and able leadership of the Society by Bishop Gapp, which was endorsed by a unanimous rising vote of gratitude to Bishop Gapp.

The Secretary then presented the names of those members who had passed on to their eternal home during the past year. These known were:

Mrs. Caroline Buchhaupt	Mrs. George Bergstresser
Mrs. J. V. Honeycutt	Warren Breinig
Susan Kachline	Miss Anna Miller

A memorial hymn was sung.

The secretary then reported a total membership of 409. 187 of this member were from the Bethlehem area, 78 from Nazareth, 19 from Allentown, 125 from other localities.

The assembly then moved upstairs to the main Sunday School auditorium and Dr. Weinlick presented the speaker, Dr. Edwin A. Sawyer, pastor of the Nazareth Moravian Church. He presented a paper on "Religious Enthusiasm In The Early Bethlehem and Nazareth Settlements."

The speaker stated: Early immigrations from Europe brought into these settlements a brand of religious enthusiasm unique not only in the Moravian Church but to all Christendom.

He credited this religion of the heart to Count Zinzendorf and termed it a protest against rationalism and an effort to return to the historic Christianity of the New Testament. The Count captured the hearts of the people as he expounded on the Cross and the Passion of Christ.

The great influence of other leaders such as Spangenberg, David Nitchmann, and Peter Boehler was emphasized. So powerful was their religious influence that by 1747, a few years after their arrival the brethren of this area had spread themselves into other colonies and established 31 preaching places.

Out of this period enlarged efforts developed in evangelizing the Indians, resulting in establishing important mission stations. One of the first of these converted Indians became interpreter and guide to David Zeisberger, extending the missions into Western Pennsylvania and Ohio.

It was the enthusiasm of the religious life in early Bethlehem and Nazareth that made it possible to bear the privations of the frontier life. Not only were these Pennsylvania settlements self supporting from the start, but they financed home and foreign missionary work as well.

The speaker stated that in the gathering in of only genuinely awakened souls whose religion was a matter of the heart, the impression was given to outsiders that the Moravians regarded themselves as "The Church."

Extravagant emphasis upon the wounds and blood of Christ by such leaders as Bishop de Watteville and Camerhoff led to withdrawal of some of the other leaders who retired to other Moravian work in Philadelphia and vicinity.

This type of expression of religious experience did not last. There was a sifting time and eventually the Moravians became more like other religious leaders in the preaching of the Gospel and the Atonement. Today, concluded the speaker, the Church may well be accused of allowing a fear of fanatacism to keep it from enjoying a healthy enthusiasm that was part of the glory of our forefathers.

W. H. Kortz, Secretary

THE 102ND ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MORAVIAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY OCTOBER 8, 1959

The Society met for its 102nd annual meeting in the museum rooms of the Whitefield House, called to order by the President John R. Weinlick at 10:15 a.m. October 8, 1959. There were 16 members present.

The minutes of the last annual meeting had been approved by the Executive Committee in its meeting of December 4, 1958 and therefore were not read at today's session.

The Treasurer rendered his annual statement and report which was accepted and approved. This was signed by the auditors Andrew G. Kern and Frank R. Huth. The Treasurer, William E. Henry, reported receipts for the year of $2,997.20 including $1,000 for the sale of a matured government bond, and disbursements of $2272.22, including investment in a 2⅝% interest bearing government bond in the amount of $1506.39. Cash on hand as of October 1, 1959 was $2964.99. Investments at book value are $15,360.48 and the market value $18,842.84. Trust Funds are $12,643.05. The full report is on file with the secretary.

The Curator's report was called for; he had no report.

The Whitefield Guild sent a written report: 19 members with the officers President Mrs. Josephine Wessels, Vice President Mrs. Lillian Beitel, Secretary Miss Carolyn Wunderly, Treasurer Mrs. Josephine Angelmire, Press Secretary Mrs. Sarah Brobst elected for 1959-1960. The Guild presented the museum with one of the 500th Moravian anniversary mugs, and a Phoebe Conrad china "Moravian Sister Doll." Papers presented at their meeting during the past year are: "Moravian Graveyards in Nazareth" by Carolyn Wunderly; "Moravian Burial Service" by Carolyn Wunderly; "Christmas Time in the Forks of the Delaware 1740, 1741, 1742" by Carolyn Wunderly; "Tile Stove pleases Town People in 1743" by Josephine Anglemire; "The Early Estabilishment of Nazareth" by Catherine Beitel; A Recording of the

Liturgical Services of the Moravian Church by Dr. Edwin Kortz; "The Barony of the Rose," written by Grace Stuart Reid in 1904, by Josephine Anglemire; "Christmas in Bethlehem", written by Ruth Hutchison, by Rev. Swavely. The Guild reported the death of the organizer and President since 1955 on June 12, 1959.

The Graveyard Committee reported new trees planted in the Indian Cemetery near Nazareth and that permission had been granted to use the Pavilion Tower to operate instruments for Civil Defense, under an agreement that the Civil Defense authorities were to restore the Pavilion to its condition when they ceased operations there. The report was accepted and the action approved.

The Library Committee report was called for: there was no report.

The Publication Committee reported that the estimated cost of publishing Dr. Weinlick's thesis "The Moravian Diaspora" was $1572.00. This is at the printers and will be ready for distribution in about a month. A list of twenty-odd possible papers available was submitted as suggestions for later consideration for printing. The consensus of opinion of the Publication Committee was that no material should be published that has been published elsewhere. The report was accepted.

Acting upon a report of the Committee appointed to study the matter of changing the membership dues it was moved to increase the active and associate memberships to $3.00 annually and the life memberships to $50.00. The other classifications are to remain the same as at present.

The matter of a charge to groups for admission to the museum rooms, since the public schools were bringing large groups at different times requiring a good bit of attention, was brought before the meeting with the question as to whether the Executive Committee or the Library Committee were to fix any charges. It was moved to authorize the Curator acting with the Library Committee to make such charges as they may determine.

The matter of planting trees, ground improvements, power mower replacement, etc. was discussed and it was moved that the Executive Committee co-operate with the S.P.G. to provide for such expense.

The sale of Transactions during the past year was reported and that there were no longer complete sets available. The matter of of reprinting missing numbers was considered and this referred to the Publications Committee to report to the Executive Committee for final action.

The Nominating Committee Robert Ziegler, Sarah H. Brobst and Allen S. Hedgecock placed in nomination the following officers and committees, whereupon on motion the Secretary cast the ballot and the Chair declared same elected, there being no other nominations from the floor:

President Emeritus	The Rt. Rev. S. H. Gapp
President	Dr. John R. Weinlick
Vice Presidents	Prof. H. H. Beck, The Rt. Rev. Kenneth G. Hamilton, Andrew G. Kern, Walter L. Peters
Secretary	William H. Kortz
Treasurer	William E. Henry
Librarian & Curator	The Rev. Edward H. Swavely
Board of Managers	Robert J. Desh, John E. Leibfried, Robert S. Taylor, Jr., Henry L. Williams, George W. Hahn
Publication Committee	Dr. John R. Weinlick, The Rt. Rev. Kenneth G. Hamilton, The Rt. Rev. S. H. Gapp, Henry B. Rau, Rev. Henry Williams
Library Committee	Walter Peters, George W. Hahn, Dr. Samuel Zeller, Elizabeth Bahnsen, Dr. John Weinlick, Mrs. Walter Peters, Rev. E. H. Swavely, Mrs. Nathan Brobst, Dr. Edwin Sawyer, Mary Henry Stites, Mrs. Elizabeth Morris, Mathew Morris, Dr. Richmond Myers, The Rev. Allen Hedgecock.
Graveyard Committee	George W. Hahn, R. F. Ziegler, J. Frederick Knecht, Frank Seyfried

The Vesper Meeting

Due to renovations in the Nazareth Moravian Church where this meeting has been held in the past, the meeting was held in the Nazareth Y.M.C.A. and here the members and friends sat down to the usual luncheon served by a committee of the Nazareth members at 1 p.m. The Nazareth Trombone Choir furnished the music. President John R. Weinlick presided at this meeting. Welcomed as special guests were the Rev. & Mrs. Mittemyer, missionaries from Dutch Guiana, South America, and the Rev. and Mrs. Wilfred Dreger, missionaries from Nicaragua, Central America.

A memorial hymn was sung in memory of those members who had passed to their eternal home during the past year. These were:

Mrs. Alice A. Bittner	Stanley D. Beidelman	William P. Gano
Lloyd P. Jones	Mrs. Earl Stroman	Mrs. Richard Scott
Jacob Schlegel	Mrs. Pearl Bishop	Mrs. Kathryn Kessler Hamilton

The speaker, Dr. Samuel V. Gapp, head of the English Department of Northeast High School, Philadelphia, Pa. presented a paper on "Philip H. Gapp, Home Missionary." Philip H. Gapp was the speaker's grandfather.

Philip H. Gapp's work started in 1848 among the Germans in Philadelphia. He had in mind a non-denominational group work, but he later was ordained a minister of the Moravian Church.

Much of his work was among immigrants who fled from intolerable conditions in the home land and who were very poor and much in need. He was supported in this work by a newly formed Home Missionary Society of the First Moravian Church in Philadelphia and the American Tract Society. His salary to meet his personal expenses was $250 a year. For nearly eight years he visited the railroad station where immigrants arrived and presented them with Bibles and tracts.

In 1859 he started Moravian work in Westfield and Palmyra, N. J. as outposts of the Philadelphia Congregation. In 1864 he terminated his connection with the Philadelphia Moravian Church to take up full time service at Palmyra and Riverside,

N. J. His work goes on today in the thriving congregations at Palmyra and Riverside.

A number of the Germans among those he ministered to in Philadelphia migrated to Lititz and other Pennsylvania communities and as far west as Minnesota where they became the nucleus for Moravian Congregations. Time did not permit the full reading of the paper on this fruitful missionary life.

After singing of a hymn the meeting adjourned.

William H. Kortz, Secretary